

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

The achievement of Ford Madox Ford as editor

Thesis

How to cite:

Tomlinson, Nora (1996). The achievement of Ford Madox Ford as editor. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 1996 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.00004a5e>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Nora Tomlinson, BA Hons., MA.

The Achievement of Ford Madox Ford as Editor

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Literature discipline of
the Faculty of Arts of the Open University.

November 1995

Author's no: K0013912
Date of submission: 7th November 1995
Date of award: 8th July 1996

RESEARCH DEGREES CENTRE

LIBRARY AUTHORISATION FORM

Please return this form to the Research Degrees Centre with the bound library copies of your thesis. All students should complete Part 1. Part 2 only applies to PhD students.

Student: NORA TOMLINSON PI: K0013912

Degree: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Thesis title: THE ACHIEVEMENT OF FERG MAROK
FERG AS EDITOR

Part 1 Open University Library Authorisation [to be completed by all students]

I confirm that I am willing for my thesis to be made available to readers by the Open University Library, and that it may be photocopied, subject to the discretion of the Librarian.

Signed: N Tomlinson Date: July 14, 1996

Part 2 British Library Authorisation [to be completed by PhD students only]

If you want a copy of your PhD thesis to be held by the British Library, you must sign a British Doctoral Thesis Agreement Form. You should return it to the Research Degrees Centre with this form and your bound thesis. *You are also required to supply a third, unbound copy of your thesis.* The British Library will use this to make a microfilm copy; it will not be returned. Information on the presentation of the thesis is given in the Agreement Form.

If your thesis is part of a collaborative group project, you will need to obtain the signatures of others involved for the Agreement Form.

The University has agreed that the lodging of your thesis with the British Library should be voluntary. Please tick either (a) or (b) to indicate your intentions.

[a] ☒ I am willing for the Open University to supply the British Library with a copy of my thesis. A signed Agreement Form and 3 copies of my thesis are attached (two bound as specified in Section 9.4 of the Research Degree Handbook and the third unbound).

[b] ☐ I do not wish the Open University to supply a copy of my thesis to the British Library.

Signed: N Tomlinson Date: July 14, 1996

ABSTRACT

The Achievement of Ford Madox Ford as Editor

This thesis challenges the conventional opinion that Ford Madox Ford was a great editor. It establishes criteria by which an editor can be judged; these are the literary and cultural opinions on which a review operates, an awareness of the needs of readers of a review as revealed in its style and content, and the way in which a review is managed. These criteria are applied to three different, though overlapping fields of enquiry. Firstly, the thesis examines how far Ford's editorial practice was consistent with his own literary and critical principles as expressed through a long and varied writing career. Secondly, it places the two reviews edited by Ford in the context of the society which produced them, The English Review in London between 1908 and 1910, and The Transatlantic Review in Paris in 1924, and compares these two reviews with a wide range of contemporary cultural journals on the basis of the three criteria outlined above. Finally the study compares Ford's achievement as editor of The English Review and The Transatlantic Review. It concludes that while Ford was a good editor in some respects, he was not the great editor which is so often claimed for him.

Acknowledgements

My grateful thanks to my two supervisors, Dr. Robert Green and Professor Graham Martin, for their rigorous criticism combined with constant kindness and support. Thanks also to Dr. Max Saunders for his generosity in sharing his knowledge of Ford with me. My greatest thanks go to my husband, whose encouragement has meant more to me than I can adequately express, and whose help with word processing has been invaluable.

The Achievement of Ford Madox Ford as Editor

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Ford Madox Ford: Literary and Critical Principles	8
Chapter 2 The Background to <u>The English Review</u>	28
Chapter 3 Late Victorian and Edwardian Cultural Journals	42
Chapter 4 The Career of <u>The English Review</u>	72
Chapter 5 The Failure of <u>The English Review</u>	86
Chapter 6 <u>The English Review</u> Editorial Policy	102
Chapter 7 The Literary Contents of <u>The English Review</u>	116
Chapter 8 The Paris Scene in the 1920s	140
Chapter 9 Cultural Journals of the Post War Period	151
Chapter 10 The Career and Failure of <u>The Transatlantic Review</u>	183
Chapter 11 <u>The Transatlantic Review</u> Editorial Policy	211
Chapter 12 The Cultural Contents of <u>The Transatlantic Review</u>	227
Conclusion	247
Bibliography	251

Introduction

Many criticisms are voiced about Ford Madox Ford as a writer; he rambled, he exaggerated or was economical with the truth and the quality of his work was inconsistent. Everyone, however, seems agreed on one thing, namely that he was a great editor. Many of his contemporaries, including those who were associated with him as he edited his two reviews, believed this. Douglas Goldring, who was Ford's assistant editor on The English Review referred to his "genius as an editor - no other word than genius is adequate, for there has been nothing like it before or since, in England or, so far as I am aware, in any other country"¹ while Nathan Asch, who wrote for Ford on The Transatlantic Review claimed that "he was a great editor, the greatest I have ever known."² When Ford was forced to give up the editorship of The English Review, Arnold Bennett wrote of his achievement; "In fifteen months Mr. Hueffer managed to publish more genuine literature than was ever, I think, got into fifteen numbers of a monthly review before."³ Wyndham Lewis, who didn't care for Ford personally, acknowledged that Ford "was probably as good an editor as could be found for an English literary review. He had by birth artistic associations and could write himself better than most editors."⁴ Even those who had fallen out with Ford, such as Violet Hunt, who felt that Ford had betrayed her, believed that he was "the greatest editor, qua editor, that has ever been."⁵

Several obituaries refer to his genius as an editor. Pound, for example, acknowledging his

¹ Douglas Goldring, South Lodge (London:1943), p.54.

² Cited in Bernard Poli, Ford Madox Ford and The Transatlantic Review (Syracuse: 1967), p.141.

³ Arnold Bennett, The New Age, Jan.27, 1910, 305.

⁴ Wyndham Lewis, Rude Assignment (London: 1928), p122.

⁵ Violet Hunt, The Flurried Years (London: 1926), p.45

own debt as a writer to Ford, added that "he founded the greatest Little Review or pre-Little Review of our time."¹ Graham Greene's tribute called him "the best literary editor England has ever had."² All Ford's biographers - Frank McShane, Alan Judd, Arthur Mizener, the most grudging, and Max Saunders, the latest - declare this genius. In the years since his death, despite reservations and debates about his status as a writer, scholars seem to have had no difficulty in accepting and admiring his editorial skills. In one of the earliest studies of The English Review, Malcolm Bradbury wrote that Ford's achievement lay in "taking literature seriously when no one else really did ... Certainly he should serve as a model for editors of literary periodicals."³ More than a decade later, Edward Krickel's assertion that "by now, Ford's editorial brilliance is acknowledged without a cavil"⁴ is representative of critical opinion of Ford's achievement as an editor.

In view of this uniform volume of praise, it is perhaps surprising that so little work has been devoted to scrutinising Ford as an editor. There are two full length studies, both by American scholars, one on each review⁵, but there has been no overall assessment of his achievement as an editor based on a detailed scrutiny of both the reviews which Ford edited. The present study began as such a comparative venture, intending to compare his editorial achievement in The English Review with that in The Transatlantic Review, but it quickly became apparent that most commentators on Ford's editorial achievement, including Ruedy and Poli, valued it largely for his discovery of new writers who later

¹ Ezra Pound, 'Ford Madox Ford: Obit', Nineteenth Century and After, cxxvi, Aug. 1939, 180.

² Graham Greene, 'Ford Madox Ford', The Spectator, cxliii, July 7, 1939, 11

³ Malcolm Bradbury, 'The English Review', The London Magazine, v., Aug. 1958, 46.

⁴ Edward Krickel, 'Lord Plushbottom in the Service of the Kingdom: Ford as Editor', in The Presence of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Sondra J. Stang (Philadelphia:1981), p.107.

⁵ Ralph Hermann Ruedy, Ford Madox Ford and the English Review, (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1976) and Poli, Ford Madox Ford and the Transatlantic Review.

became part of the literary canon. None of them actually spelled out criteria for assessing editorial achievement, and there was little attempt to compare what Ford was doing in his two reviews with what was being achieved in other contemporary cultural journals. The scope of this study was therefore enlarged to try to fill these gaps and it quickly became apparent that the universally held opinion of Ford's editorial achievement had to be challenged. The questions which really needed to be addressed were first, whether Ford was such a good editor as everybody says he was and second, how could this be assessed.

It is difficult to establish criteria for measuring editorial achievement, though a number of highly regarded editors have tried. T.S.Eliot suggested that a literary review functions to introduce new work by talented writers, to provide critical evaluation of current work and to be international, which is helpful as far as it goes. But Eliot's approach seems impossibly aloof and highminded. "It may be the function of a literary review to maintain the application, in literature, of principles which have their consequences also in politics and in private conduct; and it should maintain them without tolerating any confusion of the purposes of pure literature with the purposes of politics and ethics."¹ This, of course, rather begs the question of what Eliot understands by 'pure literature' as well as failing to suggest how literary talent might be recognised or measured.

Other editors were rather more down to earth than this, recognising that a literary journal needs to communicate with its readers. As A.R.Orage wrote; "The criterion ... is neither subject nor treatment in the abstract, but one's relations with one's readers ... Nothing is justified in writing that is not read."² This view is echoed in a tribute to Karl Miller when

¹ T.S.Eliot, 'The Function of a Literary Review', The Criterion, i, 4, July 1923, 421.

² A.R.Orage to Herbert Read, Aug 21, 1921, cited in Wallace Martin, The New Age under Orage: Chapters in English Cultural History (Manchester: 1967) p.54.

he retired in 1992 as editor of London Review of Books. "For Karl, editing is not about strokes of genius, grand visions, stylish gestures, but about the down to earth realities of a good piece of prose, about well-structured arguments and exactness of expression."¹

The combination of Eliot's rather abstract ideas and Orage's and Miller's more practical views do suggest two possible ways of beginning to assess the achievement of an editor. The first consists of a consideration of the literary or cultural principles on which the review operates, and the extent to which the review satisfies these principles. The second, which may sometimes overlap with the first, is to examine what, for Karl Miller, were 'the down to earth realities' and the concern evinced for the reader in the style, content and the layout of the review. To these two approaches may be added a third, which is to look at the management of a review. While literary reviews are not established to make large fortunes for their founders and editors, the careful husbandry of resources, both human and financial, may ensure that the review can remain in publication without compromising any of its artistic integrity. The first and third of these approaches present relatively few problems, but the second necessarily involves making value judgements about a review's contents. Where a review publishes writers whose reputations are already well established, or where it publishes new writers whose reputations are subsequently made, such judgements are unproblematic, although they inevitably rely on unspoken assumptions about the writer's place in the literary canon. Where the writers are less well known, judgements will be more subjective, and all that can be done here is to acknowledge this subjectivity.

This study has taken these three criteria - of literary and cultural principles, of the

¹ Nicholas Spice, 'Diary', London Review of Books, xiv, 21, Nov.5, 1992, 29.

readability of a review's contents and of the management of a review's business affairs -and has applied them to three different, though overlapping fields of enquiry. Firstly, it examines how far Ford's editorial practice was consistent with his own literary and critical principles as expressed through a long and varied writing career. Secondly, it has placed the reviews edited by Ford in the context of other contemporary cultural journals, and has tried to make comparative judgements based on the three criteria outlined above. Finally, the study returns to its original objective of comparing Ford's achievements as editor of The English Review and The Transatlantic Review. The outcome is that the conventional view of Ford's editorial brilliance and originality can, and indeed should be challenged.

The first of these fields of enquiry was relatively straightforward, albeit time consuming, since Ford's views on the nature and function of literature and culture are dispersed through his output of nearly fifty years as a writer, including a great deal of journalism. The second field of enquiry, an examination of other contemporary cultural journals, was less straightforward, not least because of the sheer volume of material to be absorbed. The starting point was Alvin Sullivan's four volume reference work, British Literary Magazines,¹ supplemented by Cyrena Pondrom's unpublished doctoral dissertation, English Literary Periodicals 1885-1918.² Looking at the range of cultural journals outlined in both of these works, inevitably suggested further journals to examine. Several journals, for example, contained advertisements for other journals or magazines not mentioned by Sullivan or Pondrom, while others, such as Eliot's The Criterion, carried lists of cultural journals which the editor was willing to endorse. The result was a vast survey of over a hundred cultural journals, which had to be reduced to manageable proportions.

¹ British Literary Magazines, 4 Vols, ed. Alvin Sullivan (Westport, Connecticut: 1983-1986)

² Cyrena Pondrom, English Literary Periodicals 1885-1918, (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Columbia, 1965)

For the purposes of comparison with The English Review, the journals chosen were those published in London, which contained a high proportion of cultural contents, and which would have been known to Ford; this meant the rejection, for example, of Irish cultural journals, which were addressing a different agenda and different readers from the English journals. Where the journal was short lived, as was the case with The Yellow Book and The Savoy, the complete run was examined. Where the journal was longer running but had ceased publication before Ford began work on The English Review, the last year's issues were examined, and where the journal was still running, the issues examined were generally from June 1908 to June 1909, that is the period when Ford was preparing for and publishing the first six months of The English Review. Sometimes, when a journal seemed likely to shed more light on Ford's achievement as an editor, the examination was extended to cover issues for the rest of 1909 and into 1910.

Selection of journals to compare with The Transatlantic Review was more difficult, partly because of the expansion in the number of cultural journals since 1910, and partly because The Transatlantic Review was published in three countries. For English and French journals, the focus was on those published in London and in Paris, and again, for the reasons outlined above, this meant omitting Irish and Scottish journals. Comparison with American cultural journals was confined largely to those known internationally and with

long runs, though there were some journals with very short runs published by Americans in Paris in the twenties. Again, the journals chosen for discussion contained a high proportion of cultural contents, were those known to Ford, often as a contributor, or those whose careers and contents could have provided him with useful examples. Where a journal's career shed light on Ford's achievement as an editor, its history was surveyed, but

otherwise a detailed examination was reserved for the issues from the autumn of 1923 and the whole of 1924.

For the final field of enquiry, this study first placed Ford's two journals in the context of a brief survey of the cultural life in the cities which produced them - London in 1908 to 1910, and Paris in 1924. The career of each journal was traced and its editorial policy and contents surveyed and assessed. Thus, this study begins with an outline of Ford's literary and critical principles, and then, taking each review in turn, examines contemporary cultural journalism, the review's social context, and its career, editorial policy and contents.

The study breaks new ground in its analysis of the finances of both reviews, and in contrasting them, where such material is available, with the financial management of other reviews. Specifically, it makes use of the Stow Hill papers in the House of Lords Record Office to shed light on The English Review finances, and for both journals, it analyses advertising revenue and expenditure as an additional tool for understanding their financial affairs. It also makes use of material which has become available since the full length studies of each review appeared. The most valuable are the fourth volume of The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad,¹ which covers The English Review years, and the correspondence between Ford and Jeanne Foster,² which covers The Transatlantic Review period.

¹ The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad: Vol.4, 1908-1911, ed. Frederick R. Karl and Laurence Davies (Cambridge: 1990)

² Janice and Richard Londraville, 'A Portrait of Ford Madox Ford: unpublished letters from the Ford Foster Friendship', English Literature in Transition, Vol.33, 2, 1990.

Chapter 1 Ford Madox Ford: Literary and Critical Principles

Ford's enthusiasm for literature as a civilizing force illuminates the writing of both his fiction and non-fiction, but it is precisely the universality of this enthusiasm in his writings which creates problems for the commentator trying to establish Ford's literary and critical principles. Almost everything he wrote, with the possible exception of the children's books written when he was a very young man, can be quarried for his views on literature. However, an extended reading of Ford's work does reveal certain ideas, many of them held consistently for nearly half a century of writing. This is not to suggest that his views are fossilised in the late Victorian and early Edwardian periods - Ford's capacity to recognize and endorse new ideas, his openness to new forms of writing is impressive - but to stress that many enthusiasms and dislikes remain constant and forceful throughout his writing career.

Ford was, of course, very well qualified to formulate ideas on the function of literature and the practice of writing. Not only was he extremely widely read, but he knew, often intimately, writers whose work spanned the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first four decades of the twentieth. Through his grandfather's household, for example, he met Turgenev and Christina Rossetti. His childhood friends were the Garnetts and the young Rossettis and he met Thomas Hardy at a tea-party while still in his teens. Ford recognized the advantage which this gave him. "I ... considered myself as belonging, by right of birth to the governing classes of the artistic and literary worlds."¹ As a young man living in southern England, he was in regular contact with Joseph Conrad, H.G.Wells, Stephen Crane and Henry James; he even drew a map of the literary connections of that

¹ Ford Madox Ford, *Return To Yesterday* (London: 1931; reprinted New York: 1957), p.13.

part of the world.¹ His editorship of The English Review consolidated his familiarity with established authors and introduced him to young writers such as Ezra Pound, D.H.Lawrence and Wyndham Lewis, who in their turn, introduced him to other new writers. His years in France, and especially in Paris, familiarized him with contemporary French and American writing, some of which he published in The Transatlantic Review. In the last years of his life, divided between the United States and France, he kept in touch with the rising generation of young writers such as Robert Lowell and Graham Greene. Few authors can claim such familiarity with so many major writers over such a long and varied period.

His authority is also endorsed by his own practice as a novelist, poet and journalist; when he wrote about what the novel could or could not do, or about the affinities between prose and poetry, he quite literally knew what he was talking about. He also consistently tried to help other writers so that he could quite justifiably write of himself that "the greater party of his conscious life had been spent in the effort to help the cause of one beautiful talent or another."² He was, quite simply, a man with a mission. "My concern in life is with Thought and the Arts, and if I had to evolve a Governing Class, it would be made up of a few poor thinkers and as many artists as are to be found in the world."³

Literature, for Ford, was partly defined by what it could do. It could, he believed, unite mankind by transcending political barriers, and it could provide a means of communication between men and women in times that drove them apart. Ford frequently declared that he

¹ Ibid., p.20.

² Ford Madox Ford, Thus To Revisit (London: 1921), p.16.

³ Ford Madox Ford, New York Is Not America (London: 1927), p.105.

cared nothing for politics and that the only republic which mattered was the republic of letters. The dedication to It Was The Nightingale apologized for the vigour with which the book "upholds the banners of the only perfect republic and the only perfect kingdom",¹ and later in the same book, he declared: "Wherever there were creative thinkers was my country. A country without artists in words, in colours, in stone, in instrumental sounds - such a country would be forever an Enemy Nation. On the other hand, every artist of whatever race was my fellow countryman."² Ford believed that literature should unite rather than separate us, "for the Art of Writing is an affair as international as are all the other Arts, as International, as Co-operative and as mutually uniting."³ Several of Ford's books set out to explore these cultural links and influences. It seems to have been the underlying force behind the vast, but uncompleted A History Of Our Time⁴ and is a major element in both The English Novel and The March of Literature; the latter was conceived as a work of comparative literature, in which Ford traced the influence of one civilisation, as well as of one writer on another. His premise that "it makes a convenient pattern to assume that writers are descended one from the other"⁵ and his vision of literature as "an immense stream, coming from the dawn and spreading its eddies for thousands of years and half the globe over,"⁶ both arise from his belief in literature as an international and a uniting force. This belief in the republic of letters was the basis for several of his ventures, and was the explicit philosophy of The Transatlantic Review.

¹ Ford Madox Ford, It Was The Nightingale (London: 1934), p.v.

² Ibid., p.59.

³ Ford Madox Ford, The English Novel (London:1930), p.4.

⁴ This was intended to be a three volume study covering the period of his own life. Only the first Volume was completed, though never published in Ford's lifetime. It is now published as: Ford Madox Ford, A History Of Our Time, ed. Solon Beinfeld and Sondra Stang (Manchester: 1988).

⁵The English Novel, p.65.

⁶ Ford Madox Ford, The March Of Literature (London: 1939), p.438.

Literature was not only a republic, but as Ford saw it, offered a means of communication between individuals, providing an account of life as it was lived, helping people to an understanding of each other: "The Function of poetry in the Republic is still, and always has been, and always will be to instill imagination - that is sympathetic insight! - into the brute that man is. It civilizes."¹ For Ford, literature was the single most important tool available for understanding ourselves: "The only human activity that has always been of extreme importance to the world is imaginative literature. It is of supreme importance because it is the only means by which humanity can express at once emotions and ideas."² Ford made its promotion the main impulse of his life: "The one thing that I desire to promote in life is sympathetic insight between man and man - the quality that is called imagination."³ As contemporary urban life became more complicated and fragmented, the individual needed literature, which, "by removing him from his immediate affairs and immersing him in those of his fellows ... give(s) him a better view of the complicated predicaments which surround him."⁴

Ford was also a great believer in the restorative as well as the curative powers of literature. "We must have - or we die - some figure forever prosperous, for ever sunny, forever frugally generous, and we must have above all, the views of life and the poetry of such to take about with us."⁵ There was for Ford a kind of essential cultural baggage without which we should live deprived lives: "There are certain books, differing widely the one from the other, that are almost universally beloved ... They are innocent without being

¹ Ford Madox Ford, The Chapbook, 27, July 1922, 14.

² Return To Yesterday, p.178.

³ Ford Madox Ford, 'Kultur Mensch Continued', Outlook, 34, Nov.7, 1914, 594.

⁴ The English Novel, p.21.

⁵ The March Of Literature, p.194.

contemptible; virtuous without being an insupportable puritan-hypocrisy; admirably conceived without formal perfection ... they are necessary to a world that would be poorer without them."¹ The books which Ford asked to be sent to him in the trenches were Turgenev's Fathers and Children, Flaubert's Trois Contes, Mallarmé's Après-midi d'un Faune, Conrad's Youth, James' What Maisie Knew and W.H.Hudson's Nature In Downland.² His favourite nineteenth century English novelists were Jane Austen, Elizabeth Gaskell and Anthony Trollope.³

Ford didn't simply think that literature, like nasty medicine, was good for us. For him, perhaps more than for most critics, the key aspect of literature was that it should be enjoyable. "The function of Literature as an art is to give joy to the reader"⁴ and "It is a thing made for the increase of joy and mirth, of happiness ... It is the business of a book to be easy to read."⁵ He wrote, as apparently he taught, with enthusiasm for certain writers and certain books, and the criterion for selection for literary texts to be included in his own works such as The English Novel and The March Of Literature was his own enjoyment. He suggested that his method of recommendation was rather like turning students loose in a library. "Choose a book. Try it out thoroughly. If, after a sincere trial, you find it distasteful, reject it and try something else." His advice could be trusted, he felt, because it came from "an old man mad about writing" who "contrary to the habits of the learned, ... must write only about the books I have found attractive."⁶

¹ Ibid., p.605.

² Ford Madox Ford, No Enemy (New York: 1929), p.176.

³ The English Novel, p.99.

⁴ Ford Madox Ford, 'The Year 1908', Tribune, Jan.4, 1908, 2.

⁵ Ford Madox Ford, Ancient Lights and Certain New Reflections (London: 1911), p.259.

⁶ The March Of Literature, p.6.

Side by side with his literary enthusiasms, Ford also had several fiercely held dislikes, perhaps the strongest being literature which moralized: "The first duty of an artist is not to comment and precisely not to moralize."¹ Ford was absolutely clear about the dangers of writing with a didactic purpose: "A polemical pamphlet, a tract, a novel with a purpose: how dangerous a thing it is! It endangers alike the cause for which it is written and the cause which it combats ... And for the practising writer it is still more dangerous, since it may colour his views of life, and it is the business of the practising writer to see life as it is."² He disliked the reforming passion of so many novelists, because it reduced the novel simply to a "vehicle for the reform of abuses",³ and because it lessened the artistic quality: "I hold profoundly the view that the moment an artist introduces propaganda of whatever kind into his works of art, he ceases to be an artist."⁴ It isn't that Ford thought that literature lacked a moral purpose, but that he thought any message should be implied not stated: "Draw life ... to the life, and your moral will draw itself ... Every work of art has a profound moral significance, but you must not attempt to impose your own laws upon nature."⁵ If the writer renders effectively then the moral will emerge: "The statement of morals, the formulation of ethical codes, appears to me to be no business of the novelist. His business is to draw pictures of possible conditions; the reader's business being to draw the morals."⁶

¹ Ford Madox Ford, Preface to Stories From de Maupassant, trans. E.M. (London: 1903), p.xvi.

² Ford Madox Ford, 'Literary Portraits XVII', Tribune, Nov. 16, 1907, 2.

³ The English Novel, p.97.

⁴ Ford Madox Ford, 'Hands Off The Arts', American Mercury, 34, April 1935, cited in David Dow Harvey, Ford Madox Ford, 1873-1939: A Bibliography Of Works And Criticism (Princeton: 1962), pp. 260-261.

⁵ Preface to Stories from de Maupassant, p.xviii.

⁶ Ford Madox Ford, 'Professor Saintsbury and the English 'Nuvvle' ', Outlook, 32, Nov.1, 1913, 606.

The target for which Ford reserved his greatest scorn was the intellectual, or Academicist. This dislike of the 'Academy' was in part inherited from his grandfather, Ford Madox Brown, and like Brown's, the dislike was life-long, deep rooted and not consistently rational. Ford was also a practising writer, rather than a professional critic or scholar; his literary critical principles derive not from other critics, but from writers, such as Flaubert, Maupassant, Conrad and James, whose work he admired. His attitude is captured in a comment made in a letter to John Galsworthy; "I don't write as a critic, which I am not, but as a fellow craftsman who looks at a piece of work and wonders what he would have made of it himself."¹ Criticism, he felt, was best "not in the hands of the learned, but in those of the artist practitioners ... men and women who love each their art as they practise them."² His own criticism was simply an offshoot from his own practice as a creative writer, hence his vehement dislike of the academic critic. The worst kind of official academic bureaucracy was, Ford believed, to be found in Germany, and was the focus of a series of attacks in Outlook between September and November of 1914.³ Germany supported "State-engendered professorialism" and for Ford, "L'ennemi, c'est le professeur."⁴ He felt that Germany had destroyed a genuine spirit of scholarship, substituting "philological pedantry."⁵ However, Germany was not alone in this. One of the regrets which Ford expressed in Thus To Revisit, written after the Great War, was that Academicism "is triumphant in these islands as it never was before." The result for the nation was, in Ford's view, disastrous: "Stodginess and Academicism at the fount of a

¹ Ford to Galsworthy, no date, in Critical Writings of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Frank MacShane (Lincoln, Nebraska: 1964), p.90.

² The March Of Literature, p.6.

³ These reappear with very little alteration in Ford's When Blood is Their Argument (London:1915).

⁴ Ford Madox Ford, 'Germania', Outlook, Oct.3, 1914, 431.

⁵ Ibid., 'Goethe as Superman', Oct.17, 1914, 493.

nation's intellect mean ten-fold materialism in the race that is content to endure them."¹

The typical Academic critic was "slightly querulous, dark creaking, on the whole dyspeptic."² Ford parodied him brilliantly as Bulfin in Mr. Bosphorus and the Muses:

I must appear a venial parasite;
Sneak-thief of laurels, carneyer
To the be-wigged and ruffled prosperous;
Pimp to the general unthinking herd.³

Ford's dislike of "scholasticism" was extreme: "The most vulgar excesses of the most popular press are better for the nation, for humanity, and even for the arts, than the least deleterious of pompous scholasticisms,"⁴ and were responsible for "the fact that the English, as a nation, hardly read at all."⁵ Ford was still fulminating about the effects of all this in his last book: "The intrusion of the learned into fields of literature is almost always a disaster and the whole paraphernalia of universities, scholars, professors and dons, serves, as a rule, for little more than philological exercises having as much use for the world as, say a collection of postage stamps."⁶ This is hardly flattering to scholars (or indeed to philatelists) but is perhaps a measure of the strength of Ford's feelings on the subject.

If pedantry was seen by Ford as one enemy of culture, another, almost equally detested, was commercialism. It has to be said, of course, that although he made his living from writing, Ford never made much money from it, and he was, in any case, notoriously bad

¹ Thus To Revisit, pp. 61 and 63.

² *Ibid.*, p.169.

³ Ford Madox Ford, Mr. Bosphorus and the Muses (London: 1923), p.48.

⁴ New York Is Not America, pp.148-149.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.147.

⁶ The March Of Literature, p.354.

at handling both his own and his reviews' financial affairs, which may have coloured his judgement. He pointed out that the great English names of the early years of the twentieth century were not those of writers but of manufacturers such as Beecham, Dewar, Cadbury and Pears.¹ Commercialism was a major target of some of Ford's editorials in The English Review in which he accused the state in England of being solely concerned with materialism, so that the efforts of imaginative artists were in danger of being swamped.

Ford's anger at the effects of "scholasticism" and commercialism is linked to his distress at what he saw as the appalling state of national culture, though he seemed to think that cultural anarchy was a natural condition of what he called 'Anglo-Saxondom'; "The Arts have bulked always so little in the public lives of Anglo-Saxondom."² He described this as the "Anglo-Saxon want of receptivity" which "opposes ... any new form of art ... any form of art at all."³ The country was in the grip of a "fatal lethargy" which had "settled down upon publishers as upon authors, upon the press, and above all upon the public."⁴ The English Review was founded precisely to overcome this lethargy, to awaken the thought which seemed to Ford to be so lamentably lacking, and to give writers the status they deserved. Ford was convinced that writers in England were despised, having a social status marginally "beneath the governess and the vicar and just above the servants."⁵ It was this lack of enthusiasm for the arts in general and for his own work in particular, which caused Ford, in the twenties, to live and work abroad.

¹ Ford Madox Ford, 'M. Anatole France and 'L'Affaire Dreyfus' ', Outlook, 32, Dec.13, 1913, 826.

² A History Of Our Times, p.48.

³ Thus To Revisit, p.80.

⁴ Ancient Lights, p.179.

⁵ Ford Madox Ford, Henry James: A Critical Study (London: 1914), p.145.

Not surprisingly, given that Ford was such a prolific writer himself, many of his statements about literature are concerned with technique. Literature should render, not instruct. The word 'render' first appears in Ford's early art commentaries and refers to the Pre-Raphaelite characteristic of "the study of absolute realism and of the almost minuteness of rendering."¹ He did not use the word in his writing about literature until the war years though he claimed that "for a quarter of a century I have preached the doctrine ... that the rendering of the material facts of life, without comment, and in exact language, is poetry, and that poetry is the only thing in life."² Ford praised Henry James because he "more than anybody else has observed society as it now is, and more than anybody else has faithfully rendered his observations for us."³ For Ford and Conrad, "a novel was the rendering of an Affair" and Conrad's approach, which Ford probably admired and praised above all others, was "the sheer attempt to reproduce in words life as it presents itself to the intelligent observer."⁴

Ford did not confuse rendering with the accumulation of facts; rendering should give impressions rather than facts. "I have for facts a most profound contempt. I try to give you what I see to be the spirit of an age, of a town, of a movement."⁵ He outlined what he understood by impressionism, and as so often in Ford's writing, the ideas are illustrated by example, in this case, by a simple line sketch from Hogarth, suggesting a watchman with a pike over his shoulder and a dog at his heels going in at a door, which Ford admired for

¹ Ford Madox Ford, Ford Madox Brown: A Record Of His Life And Work (London: 1896), p.412.

² Ford Madox Ford, 'A Jubilee', Outlook, 36, July 10, 1915, 46.

³ Henry James, p.47.

⁴ Thus To Revisit, pp.44 and 46.

⁵ Ancient Lights, p.xv.

its economy and suggestiveness.¹

Impressionism worked by personal observation, by careful consideration of the mind of the receiver of the impression, so that "a picture should come out of its frame and seize the spectator."² The image should either be as hard and as definite as a tin-tack,"³ or, for a longer piece of writing,

you must state your argument, you must illustrate it and then you must stick in something that appears to have nothing to do with either subject or illustration, so that the reader will exclaim: 'What the devil is the fellow driving at?'... And then in the last few lines, you will draw towards you the master-string of that seeming confusion, and the whole pattern of the carpet, the whole design of the net-work will be apparent.⁴

Readers of Ford will recognise this as an accurate description of the way much of his prose, both fiction and non-fiction, actually operates, and may indeed share some of the irritation of his imaginary reader as the technique does not always achieve its end. In 1924, for example, this technique was providing both the delicate nuances of sensibility of Some Do Not and the long rambling commentaries in The Transatlantic Review.

Ford set out the requirements for this kind of writing to work effectively, since it required from the author "an increased attention to the quality of words, which gave to its products a singular vividness."⁵ Good writing did not simply happen, but required great care and

¹ Ford Madox Ford, 'On Impressionism', Poetry and Drama, 2, June 1914, 170.

² Ibid., Dec. 1914, 378.

³ Ibid., June 1914, 172.

⁴ Ibid., Dec. 1914, 377-378.

⁵ The March Of Literature, pp.766-767.

labour from the writer: "A poet must trouble himself about the metrical sound, about the vowels and consonantal sounds, about the exact sense and application of the words he uses."¹ Only with good technical skills could a writer hope to succeed: "It is no good having the best doctrine in the world if your technique is defective, just as there is no use in having the best story in the world if you do not tell it well."² Ford constantly complained that very few English writers could be bothered with technique, and hoped to improve this, declaring that "I am interested only in how to write, and ... I care nothing - nothing in the world! - what a man writes about."³ One of the delights of his collaboration with Conrad was the "pleasure of eternal technical discussion"⁴ and Conrad's "sheer workmanlikeness" since "it is in the pausing for a word that lies the salvation of all writers."⁵

This concern for and delight in technique carried over into Ford's criticism. What he admired most in other writers was clarity, and a small verbal characteristic which he called 'surprise': "Art is clarity; art is economy; art is surprise."⁶ These were the qualities which he singled out for praise in a preface which he wrote for his wife's translation of some Maupassant stories:

Every word is simple and colloquial, but each is vivid and exact; there is never a familiar (which means never an uninteresting) succession of phrases. But - and this is the most important quality of all - no unusual or precious word stands out ... These qualities in a 'style', the slight

¹ Ford Madox Ford, Rossetti: A Critical Essay On His Art (London: 1902), p.170.

² Ford Madox Ford, 'Signor Marinetti, Mr. Lloyd George, St. Katherine and Others', Outlook, 34, July 14, 1914, 46.

³ Thus To Revisit, p.32.

⁴ Ford Madox Ford, Joseph Conrad: A Personal Remembrance (London: 1924), p. 49.

⁵ Ford Madox Ford, Mightier Than The Sword (London: 1938), pp. 193 and 105.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.75-76.

crepitations of surprise, like the small explosions in a motor, keep the story running and lend to it actuality and life. They make it interesting at the third and fourth reading.¹

Almost thirty years later, Ford, although using different imagery, praised Hemingway's style in a very similar way: "Hemingway's words strike you, each one as if they were pebbles fetched fresh from a brook. They live and shine, each in its place. The aim - the achievement - of the great prose writer is to use words so that they shall seem new and alive ... This gift Hemingway has supremely."²

Ford himself aimed for an unobtrusive style, wanting to write in a familiar conversational way which would engage with the reader. "I suppose that what I have been aiming at all my life is a literary form that will produce the effect of a quiet voice going on talking and talking, without much ejaculation, without the employment of any verbal strangeness - just quietly saying things."³ It was also a voice which he wanted to produce in his poetry: "I should like to write all my poems - so that they would be like the quiet talking of someone walking along a path behind someone he loved very much - quiet, rather desultory talking, going on, stopping, with long pauses, as the quiet mind works."⁴ This quiet conversational tone required the use of anecdote and digression which are a hall mark of much of Ford's writing. He was quite clear about the need for this: "When I wish to give the effect of a city or the exact incidence of a moral apothegm, I try to do it with an anecdote, essaying the rendering of a human phrase or the twist of a crooked individual's mouth, rather than

¹ Preface to Stories from de Maupassant, pp. xi-xii.

² Ford Madox Ford, Introduction to Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms, in The Ford Madox Ford Reader, ed. Sondra Stang (Manchester: 1986), p.251.

³ Ford Madox Ford, 'Les Jeunes and Des Imagistes'. (Second Notice), Outlook, 33, May 16, 1914, 683.

⁴ Ford Madox Ford, 'Notes for a Lecture on Vers Libre' given in New York in the 1920s', in MacShane, pp. 155-156.

with any generalisation of a more academic kind."¹ Ford is frequently accused of inaccuracy, of distortion, even of lying, but these criticisms ignore the fact not only that Ford was aware of his tendency towards the anecdotal, but that he regarded it as an essential part of his own technique. "One may naturally exaggerate - one does."² He knew that he digressed: "My brain, I think, is a sort of dovecote. The thoughts from it fly round and round, seem about to settle and circle even further than before and more and more swiftly."³ The point is that for Ford, this technique enabled him to render more exactly whatever he was writing about. As he explained in the preface to his book on Joseph Conrad, "This then is a novel, not a monograph, not a portrait, not a narration ... It is the rendering of an affair intended first of all to make you see the subject in his scenery."⁴

What Ford deplored in other writers was a tendency "to dissociate themselves from the life and language of the day" and to opt instead for "a language between the extremes of the dreadful moral rhetoric of a Ruskin or the heavy and morose dogmatism of a Herbert Spencer."⁵ The problem was particularly acute in the writing of poetry because "it is too much practised in temples and too little in motor-buses - LITERARY ! LITERARY ! LITERARY !" ⁶ Verse became associated in Ford's mind with excessive emotion, with aloofness from life, with deliberately poetic language which was "obsolescent, pompous, alliterative."⁷ Ford felt very strongly that concern for the reader should be the first aim of

¹ New York Is Not America, p.86.

² Ibid., p.98.

³ It Was The Nightingale, p.233.

⁴ Joseph Conrad, p.6.

⁵ The March Of Literature, p.692 and pp.694-695..

⁶ Ford to Lucy Masterman, Jan 12, 1912, Macshane, p.154.

⁷ Ford Madox Ford, 'Mr. Sturge Moore and 'The Sea is Kind', Outlook, 33, May 9, 1914, 559.

every writer; every aspect of technique - rendering, surprise, digression, anecdote or whatever - existed solely to capture the reader's interest. "Always consider the impression that you are making upon the mind of the reader, and always consider that the first impression with which you present him will be so strong that it will be all that you can ever do to efface it, to alter it, or even quite slightly to modify it."¹

For Ford literature and criticism were inseparable, because he saw criticism both as a creative activity and as a means of conveying his own enthusiasm for literature to others. His own critical practice was marked by charity and enthusiasm; his critical method, like that of so much of his other writing was anecdotal and impressionist, and his views were very much his own. Much of his critical energy was directed towards his enthusiasm for individual writers, for literary movements and for literary forms, particularly the novel. In the context of Ford's performance as an editor, it is perhaps worth stressing Ford's charity; he believed that "to hurt people's feelings by words is the most contemptible of all human employments."² He disliked belabouring "any of his fellow writers, living or dead,"³ and with one or two surprising exceptions, such as his discussion of the work of Fielding and Cervantes, Ford wrote, not uncritically, but with warmth and understanding. Fundamentally he saw the critic's role as a constructive one: "It is not my business to appraise. Appraisements imply censures and it is not one writer's business to censure others. A writer should expound other writers or let them alone."⁴

¹ Thus To Revisit, p.9.

² Ford Madox Ford to his daughter Julia, Sep.11, 1935, in The Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. R.M.Ludwig (Princeton: 1954), p.241.

³ The March Of Literature, p.570.

⁴ Introduction to A Farewell To Arms in Ford Reader, p. 250.

Ford's enthusiasms existed independently both of personal feeling and of current fashion. For example, his disagreement with Conrad about the serialisation of Conrad's autobiography in The English Review, never interfered with his life long admiration of Conrad's writing, and he provided a lavish endorsement of Hemingway's skills as a writer in his introduction to A Farewell to Arms despite Hemingway's shabby treatment of Ford during The Transatlantic Review period. Ford was not the most equable of men in his personal relationships, but he never carried any personal disagreements over into his literary judgements.

In theory at least, Ford believed in the detachment of the critic: "Criticism is not the warm expression of sentiment, but the cool expression of a man standing back and viewing with cold eyes the object upon which he is able to descant. Indeed, in the final depths, criticism is the explanation of the appeal made by a work of art to humanity."¹ The critic ought to have an open mind and to be receptive to new ideas, though Ford acknowledged the difficulty of this. In a passage which reads like part of a Modernist manifesto, he wrote: "Nothing is more difficult, nothing is more terrible than to look things in the face. We have to be ready to recognize, and if we are strong enough to acclaim, that things seeming to us hideous may embody a New Beauty ... if we have consciences, we must seek to perceive order in this disorder, beauty in what shocks us."² Ford perhaps exaggerated his own difficulty with new writing; his editorial practice, if nothing else, demonstrated his receptivity to it, and it was a matter of principle with him to encourage new writers: "Few agents will handle the work of young authors who have always been my particular pre-

¹ The March Of Literature, p.169.

² Ford Madox Ford, The Critical Attitude (London: 1911), pp.8-9, reprinted from an editorial in the last issue of The English Review he edited, Vol.IV, Feb 1910, 534.

occupation."¹ The encouragement was not always appreciated; while he liked to think of himself as a kind of benevolent grandfather, the description he gave of himself in a letter to Gertrude Stein is perhaps nearer the truth: "I really exist as a sort of half-way house between the non-publishable youth and real money - a sort of green baize door that everyone kicks both upon entering and leaving."²

In practice, while Ford's own criticism certainly demonstrates his willingness to accept new ideas and new values, it is not remarkable for its coolness and detachment. His critical writing is frequently passionate, either with anger or enthusiasm, and may appear, at least on a first reading, to ramble. Ford's criticism cannot be called scholarly, though he decried only scholasticism, not scholarship: "Accuracy of mind and a certain erudition are as necessary to the imaginative writer as is native genius."³ He did not, however, wish to appear highbrow, and preferred to address himself not to intellectuals, but to the ordinary citizen, to "the cabman round the corner."⁴ To judge Ford's critical writings as if they were a series of scholarly monographs is to misread them. Criticism for Ford was simply an aspect of writing, which like fiction and autobiography, used anecdote, impression and even "for a definite purpose, a carefully studied exaggeration"⁵ to provide the reader with an insight into the working's of a writer's mind.

Given that the writers who Ford most admired were novelists and poets, it is hardly surprising that the bulk of his critical writing is devoted to prose and poetry; drama

¹ Return To Yesterday, p.149.

² Ford to Gertrude Stein, Sep. 18, 1924, Ludwig, p.162.

³ Ford Madox Ford, Provence, (London: 1938), p.222.

⁴ 'On Impressionism', Poetry and Drama, 2, Dec 1914, 329.

⁵ Henry James, p.39.

features very little in his own creative writing, and his critical commentaries say very little about any kind of 'theatrical' experience, whether of drama, opera, ballet or cinema. In addition to his conviction that poetry was a civilizing force and should be accessible, Ford was a believer in 'vers libre' because it was the method of writing which enabled the poet to render objects accurately: "No exigency of metre must interfere with the personal cadence of the writer's mind or the pressure of the recorded emotion."¹ He recognized similarities between poetry and prose, arguing that "creative prose *is* poetry"² and that poets "should have insisted on capturing prose for themselves from the start."³ It was certainly how he tried to write his own poetry: "I found that I was trying to do exactly the same thing as I had always been trying to do in prose,"⁴ that is, to write quietly, lucidly and conversationally.

Ford was an enthusiastic advocate for both the reading and the writing of novels. Of his first encounter with Conrad's Almayer's Folly he wrote: "I think that I had then the rarest literary pleasure of my existence. It was to come into contact with a spirit of romance, of adventure, of distant lands, and with an English that was new, magic and unsurpassed."⁵ The writing of novels was "the only occupation for a proper man"⁶ and his 'Personal Remembrance' of Conrad records and celebrates his collaboration with him as they struggled to find the language and form which would be appropriate for their concept of the novel: "We agreed that the novel is absolutely the only vehicle for the thought of our

¹ Thus To Revisit, pp. 206-207.

² The Chapbook, 27, July 1922, 14.

³ Ford Madox Ford, 'Mr. Sturge Moore and 'The Sea is Kind' ', Outlook, 33, Apr. 25, 1914, 559.

⁴ 'Notes for a Lecture on Vers Libre', MacShane, pp.155-156.

⁵ Ancient Lights, p.226.

⁶ Ford Madox Ford, Introduction to Joseph Conrad, The Sisters (New York: 1928), p.3.

day. With the novel you can do anything."¹ Ford's The English Novel was written to provide students with an introduction to the novel in English. In this work, Ford recognized the widespread appetite for fiction which had always existed, and offered reading suggestions, in which his enthusiasm for the form in general and for some novelists in particular are strongly expressed.

Ford did not feel that he had to follow literary trends. He attacked Victorian 'Great Figures' such as Ruskin, Tennyson and George Eliot, and admitted that until he came to edit The English Review he had read no Hardy, because "to normal healthy youth ... Mr. Hardy was already a Classic - and a Classic is a thing you do not read."² He disliked the early work of Yeats because he felt it was affected: "I hated, and do still hate, people who poke about among legends and insist on the charms of remote islands."³ His last recorded letter was a defence of Finnegan's Wake after a poor review. Although Joyce's prose didn't conform to Ford's ideal of clarity and economy, he valued and was prepared to support Joyce's use of the ambiguities of the English language because "it maps the verges of the word user's habitable universe."⁴

Unlike T.S.Eliot, Ford is seldom thought of as a seminal critical thinker and writer about literature. Ezra Pound may unwittingly have uncovered the reason for this when he wrote to Ford: "You are all right as long as you are talking about prose or style, when you get off that you go alright until you strike something decorative, after which you rabble like a

¹ Joseph Conrad, p.208.

² Mightier Than The Sword, p.124.

³ Ford Madox Ford, 'Mr. W.B.Yeats and his New Poems', Outlook, 33, June 6, 1914, 783.

⁴ Ford to the editor of The Saturday Review of Literature, June 3, 1939, in Ford Reader, p.290.

bloody brebis."¹ Certainly it is possible to sympathise with Pound's view that Ford 'rabbled'; it was a feature of his writing and his personality which irritated some of the younger contributors to The Transatlantic Review. The point is that he rambled with a purpose; his critical method is all of a piece with his theories of writing, theories which he held consistently for the whole of his writing life. His achievements as a critic are an enthusiasm for and deep knowledge of his subject, together with his insistence that literature should communicate and have a relevance to ordinary life. The bulk of his writings embody both the preaching and the practising of these ideals: "I may really say that, for a quarter of a century, I have kept before me one unflinching aim - to register my own times in terms of my own times, and still more to urge those who are better poets and prose writers than myself to have the same end."² It is significant for his role as editor that he rated his efforts as evangelist for the cause of literature more highly than his own practice of it, though it is beyond the scope of this study to assess his literary achievements except where he makes a literary as distinct from an editorial contribution to one of his reviews.

¹ Pound to Ford, dated sometime between 1921 and 1924, in Pound/Ford: The Story of a Literary Friendship, ed. Brita Lindberg-Seyersted (New York: 1982), p.60.

² 'Impressionism - Some Speculations', Poetry, 2, Aug. and Sep. 1913, reprinted in Macshane, p.141.

Chapter 2 The Background to The English Review

The years during which Ford was working on The English Review, from the summer of 1908 when the review was being planned, to the first months of 1910, after which Ford was no longer involved in editing it, are Edwardian Years; Edward VII reigned from February 1901 to May 1910. Many commentators have acknowledged the difficulties of trying to define Edwardian England within these dates, and this study will do no more than outline some of the political, social and cultural features of the years immediately preceding and including Ford's first editorial venture. Politically, it was time of change and turmoil.¹ The Boer War (1899-1902) had revealed the emptiness of a great deal of imperial rhetoric, which expended money and lives in defence of remote territories, yet which ignored the dire poverty of so many citizens at home. While there was no major economic depression in the first decade of the twentieth century, Britain's share of world trade continued to decline, as her commercial as well as her imperial supremacy were being increasingly challenged by other industrial nations, most notably by the United States and Germany. Additionally, incomes in this country rose less than those of her competitors. By the end of Edward's reign increasing fears of French imperial rivalry and German military aggression were being expressed. Not only were newspapers full of expressions of concern at Germany's military aggrandizement, but there was also what Samuel Hynes calls 'Invasion Literature' typified by Erskine Childers' The Riddle of the Sands.² Hynes also points to the Boy Scout movement which was seen both as a preparation for war and for

¹ In the account which follows I have relied heavily on the books listed below:
G.Dangerfield, The Strange Death of Liberal England (London: 1936)
Samuel Hynes, The Edwardian Turn of Mind (Princeton: 1968, repr. London: 1991)
Edwardian England: 1901-1914, ed. Simon Nowell-Smith (London: 1964)
Edwardian England, ed. Donald Read (London: 1982)
Jonathan Rose, The Edwardian Temperament (Athens, Ohio: 1986)
Paul Thompson, The Edwardians (London: 1975, repr.1977)

² Samuel Hynes, The Edwardian Turn of Mind, pp.34-35.

the defence of the empire, and as a campaign against radicalism and socialism.¹

The Liberal landslide victory of 1906 also saw the return of 29 Labour MPs; this increased to 40 after the general election in January 1910, thus heralding the end of the domination of Parliament by the Liberal and Tory parties. There was strife both within and outside Parliament. Commons and Lords were in conflict over the taxation demands in the budget of 1909, required partly to increase naval expenditure, but also to try to use taxation to redistribute wealth. The budget proposed pensions of £13 a year for men over 70, to be paid for by a tax on inherited wealth. When the House of Lords attempted to veto this, there was a major constitutional crisis about whether the power of government resided in an elected lower house or a non-elected, largely hereditary upper chamber. The most militant years of the suffragette movement were those immediately preceding the Great War, but women's demand for the vote was already an important and controversial issue by 1908. Unemployment had been rising since 1906, and in 1908 was at its highest level since 1886; labour stoppages in the same year equalled the total for the previous decade.²

One striking feature of the Edwardian years was the enormous gulf between the extremes of wealth and poverty. Legislation had begun to tackle some of the problems of chronic poverty; school meals provision became possible (though not mandatory), and medical inspection of school children, Labour Exchanges, unemployment and sickness insurance, together with old age pensions, were among the measures introduced after the Liberal victory in 1906. While they were welcomed, they seem to have had only a limited effect in improving the living and working conditions for the poorest members of society;

¹ Ibid., p.29.

² Asa Briggs in Edwardian England:1901-1914, ed. Simon Nowell-Smith, p.96.

recruiting officers in the Great War, like their predecessors in the Boer War, found that chronic undernourishment and physical malformation rendered many would-be recruits unfit for military service.¹

A powerful testimony to this inequality comes in The Condition of England, published in 1909, and written by the Liberal politician and friend of Ford, C.F.G. Masterman. The work was undoubtedly coloured by Masterman's experience of working in a settlement in Camberwell before he became a Member of Parliament, and is profoundly pessimistic. It warns "that with the vertical division between nation and nation armed to the teeth, and the horizontal division between rich and poor which has become a cosmopolitan fissure, the future of progress is still doubtful and precarious."² Masterman wrote movingly of the urban poor, who "die like flies directly they are born" or, if they live, "stunted, inefficient, overworked, underfed, ... struggle towards maturity."³ The book offers a powerful critique of the upper classes, whom Masterman calls 'Conquerors', and it delineates a world in which traditional values and stability have "fissured into a thousand diversified channels."⁴ While Masterman's view may have been extreme, it seems to have struck a chord with many Edwardian readers, going into a third edition in the year of its publication. Certainly Ford's review recognized the importance of the issues it raised by providing a number of commentaries on matters of social welfare. Indeed, the review engaged with most of the social and political concerns outlined above.

Culturally, the period which produced The English Review is difficult to categorize. Most

¹ The Edwardian Turn of Mind, p. 22.

² C.F.G. Masterman, The Condition of England, 3rd. impr. (London: 1909) p.303.

³ *Ibid.*, p.161.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.12.

of the developments associated with Modernism, such as the first post-Impressionist exhibition in London, or the Imagist Manifesto or Blast, come after Ford had ended his association with the review. Caught between the tail end of the Victorian period and a future to be increasingly dominated by the new technologies of cinema, radio and the motor car, the Edwardians seem to have been uncertain whether they were living in some kind of golden age, or experiencing the end of civilization as they knew it, a civilization that "was unwieldy, crumbling and terrifying; already the sparrows began to be afraid."¹ Threatened both by fears of invasion and by the abyss of urban poverty and squalor, many Edwardians sought refuge in an idealised rural past; Ford's own England and the English trilogy provides a good example of this kind of nostalgia. The second book, The Heart of the Country, has chapter headings such as 'Between the Hedgerows', 'Across the Fields' and 'In the Cottages' and proclaimed that "what soothes, enchants and so excellently rests us in England when we go into the country is just that feeling of stability and of tender care for the earth and its fairness."² This idealised version of Englishness was at odds with a country which by 1911, had over 80% of its population living in urban areas; with suburbs and motor car ownership expanding rapidly, rural England was becoming a spiritual as well as a literal refuge from the traumas of urban living.

The education acts of 1870 and 1902 had produced a population which was largely literate and this was reflected in the increasing amount of printed material which was available. The printed word was effectively the only mass medium available at the time of The English Review; the cinema was not yet widespread and there was no radio. The number of newspapers published in the United Kingdom increased from 2,510 in 1901 to 2,785 in

¹ Edgar Jepson, Memories of an Edwardian and Neo-Georgian (London: 1937), p.102.

² Ford Madox Ford, England and the English: An Interpretation (New York: 1907), p. 132.

1910, and by this later date London had twenty eight morning and nine evening papers.¹ Three quarters of morning and evening dailies and Sunday newspapers were concentrated in three ownership groups, Pearson, Northcliffe and the Morning Leader group. It was the age of the newspaper tycoon,² who was a figure pilloried in two works which Ford published in The English Review, Stephen Reynolds' novel, The Holy Mountain and Arnold Bennett's play, What The Public Wants. Jonathan Rose estimates that between 1881 and 1911, the newspaper reading public quadrupled as new and popular publications emerged - Tit Bits in 1890, The Daily Chronicle in 1891, The Westminster Gazette in 1893, The Daily Mail in 1896 and The Daily Mirror in 1903.³ This did not mean that every family in the land bought and read a daily newspaper; Paul Thompson calculates that daily papers reached only one fifth of the adult population, and that most homes simply took a Sunday paper.⁴ It did mean, however, that a higher proportion of the population than ever before had access to some kind of reading material.

National literacy also led to increased expenditure on the public library system and to the founding of the Workers' Educational Association; both these developments were influenced by, as well as contributing to an increasing demand for printed material. There were worries that widened access might lead to a lowering of standards of English usage, and it was partly in response to these worries that in 1907, the English Association was founded under its first president, George Saintsbury. Among its purposes was the establishment and maintenance of the correct use of spoken and written English, the

¹ Derek Hudson, in Edwardian England, p.320.

² Alan J. Lee, The Origins of the Popular Press in England, 1855-1914 (London: 1976), p.293.

³ Jonathan Rose, The Edwardian Temperament, p.166.

⁴ Paul Thompson, The Edwardians, p.199.

provision of a forum for the discussion of teaching methods and the correlation of work done in schools with university requirements.

The number of books published increased considerably in the years preceding and following the appearance of The English Review as the following chart suggests:

<u>Titles</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1900</u>	<u>1910</u>	<u>1914</u>
Total	6516	7149	10804	11537
Fiction & children's literature	1891	2109	2833	2743 ¹

Not all these were new publications; several publishers catered for a demand for cheap editions of the classics; World's Classics began to appear in 1901, Collins Classics in 1903, the Everyman series published by Dent in 1906 and Cassells People's Library in 1909. Dent's aim was "to build up the most complete library for the common man the world has seen."² Children's fiction flourished with authors such as G.A.Henty, Rudyard Kipling, J.M.Barrie, Kenneth Grahame, E.Nesbit, Beatrix Potter and Andrew Lang all writing for a children's market.³ Arthur Mee's Children's Encyclopedia first appeared in 1907. Some adult fiction achieved enormous sales - six figures was not uncommon - though the best sellers which appeared between 1900 and 1914 are rarely read today. The best sellers for the years when Ford had charge of The English Review were The Blue Lagoon by H.de Vere Stacpole in 1908, The Rosary by Florence Barclay in 1909 and The Broad Highway by Jeffrey Farnol in 1910. E.M.Forster's A Room with a View, sold only 2312 copies when

¹ Figures taken from the Appendix to The Edwardian Temperament, pp.217-221. Rose's figures in their turn are taken from what he calls an annual census of book titles published in Britain, compiled by The Publishers' Circular. Rose notes that "the compilers may have missed a few books published privately or by very obscure presses, but otherwise the returns appear to be reasonably complete." Edwardian Temperament, p.213. He gives no indication of his method of verification, so the figures may be no more than a guide to general increase in the numbers of published books in the years following 1895.

² Ernest Rhys, Everyman Remembers (London: 1931), p.244.

³ The last of Ford's children's books, Christina's Fairy Book appeared in 1906.

it was published in 1908, highlighting the contrast between the production and consumption of popular and non popular forms of fiction. While novelists such as H.G.Wells made substantial incomes from their fiction, writers including Joseph Conrad, Henry James and Ford himself struggled to achieve even quite low sales. One of Ford's strongest complaints in The English Review was about the difficulties experienced by the non-commercial writer.

It is dangerous to generalise about the kind of literature which was widely available during Ford's English Review years, except to say that the novel as a literary form was enormously popular. Fiction accounted for 90% of public library borrowing in 1908, most of this being romance, historical novels, thrillers and adventure stories.¹ It is tempting, as David Trotter points out, to try to distinguish between the highbrow - James, Conrad, Ford - the middle brow - Wells, Bennett, Galsworthy, Forster - and the low brow, which in effect means everybody else, but this kind of classification says more about fashions in literary scholarship than about what the Edwardians actually wrote and read.² Hynes suggests that many Edwardian writers were concerned with social issues rather than with literary revolution,³ and certainly there were a number of novels which attempted a thoughtful presentation of contemporary social conditions, and not simply those affecting the working classes. Thus, 1908 saw the publication of Arnold Bennett's The Old Wives' Tale and E.M.Forster's A Room with a View, in 1909, H.G.Wells' Tono-Bungay and Ann Veronica appeared and in 1910, Arnold Bennett's Clayhanger, E.M.Forster's Howards End and H.G.Wells' The History of Mr. Polly.

¹ Peter Keating, The Haunted Study: A Social History of the English Novel, 1875-1914 (London: 1989), p.417.

² David Trotter, The English Novel in History, 1875-1920 (London: 1993), p.1.

³ Samuel Hynes, Edwardian Occasions, (London: 1972), pp.20-21.

There were several developments which contributed towards the increased demand for fiction. Publishers and booksellers pursued aggressive sales campaigns aided by the fact that virtually all early twentieth century periodicals carried news about authors as well as about books, and that several were devoted exclusively to this, including The Times Literary Supplement and The Bookman. Authors, too, were helped by the increasing use of literary agents, who helped them to place work as advantageously as possible. With J.B.Pinker as his agent, Arnold Bennett's income from his writings rocketed from £276 in 1909 to £16,000 in 1912;¹ it was generous advances by the same agent which enabled Conrad to complete Under Western Eyes in 1911.

The popularity of the novel was matched by that of the theatre as a form of entertainment in the years before the Great War, with a particular emphasis on comedy, musical and music hall.² 1900 was still the heyday of the actor manager, with Herbert Beerbohm Tree at Her Majesty's, George Alexander at St. James', Charles Wyndham at Wyndham's, Cyril Maude at The Haymarket and Seymour Hicks at The Vaudeville. Between 1900 and 1924, twelve new West End theatres opened, and by 1914 there were 3000 cinemas in the United Kingdom. Plays were subject to strict censorship which dramatists, managers and actors found increasingly irksome. Edward Garnett's battle with the censors over his play, The Breaking Point, led to a petition from dramatists to the Prime Minister, and to a letter to The Times on February 26, 1908, signed by 78 writers including Ford. A Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament was set up to investigate the whole problem of censorship, and although it was decided that censorship should remain, some of the worst severities were relaxed.

¹ James Hepburn, The Author's Empty Purse and the Rise of the Literary Agent (London: 1968), p.63.

² The account which follows relies heavily on J.C.Trewin, The Edwardian Theatre (Oxford: 1976).

There were a number of significant theatrical developments during the period. The first was the establishment of the Irish National Theatre Society in 1901 under the guidance of W.B. Yeats, Lady Gregory and J.M. Synge, which found a home two years later in the Abbey theatre in Dublin. The second was the partnership between Granville Barker and John Eugene Vedrenne at the Royal Court between October 1904 and June 1907 which established the reputation of G.B. Shaw as a dramatist, and also produced plays by Ibsen, Masefield, Maeterlinck, Yeats, Galsworthy, Elizabeth Robin's play about suffragettes, Votes For Women and Euripides, in translations by Gilbert Murray. This season of 946 performances of 32 plays by 17 authors,¹ showed that it was possible to break away from the fairly bland and undemanding programmes which had hitherto been offered to the Edwardian theatre going public. The third development was the founding of provincial repertory theatres. The first was established at the Gaiety Theatre in Manchester in 1907 by Miss A.E.F. Horniman (who had provided money for the Abbey Theatre in Dublin), and this was quickly followed by the setting up of repertory theatres in Glasgow, Liverpool, Birmingham and Bristol. All of them offered wide ranging and often experimental programmes, encouraged the work of provincial dramatists and helped to inject much needed vigour into the theatrical world. Given these developments, it is surprising that The English Review gave so little space to drama.

The literary form which most clearly demonstrates the uneasy relationship between the old world and the new is poetry. Much Edwardian poetry was undoubtedly backward looking towards what John Press calls "the fag-end of Victorian Romanticism and Imperialism."² When Swinburne and Meredith died in 1909, every journal of repute published long

¹ The Edwardian Theatre, p.75.

² John Press, A Map of English Verse (London: 1969). p.1.

obituaries, praising their poetry. According to Frank Swinnerton, the poet who had the highest reputation in 1910 was Thomas Hardy, then in his seventies, followed by Rudyard Kipling, W.B. Yeats and Frank Bridges.¹ Other popular poets in the first decade of the century were Alfred Austin, Alfred Noyes, Henry Newbolt and William Watson, writers of patriotic verse. Poetry was regarded as an elevated form of expression, remote from ordinary life, and while this is generally not true of the poetry of Hardy and Kipling, it does apply to that of W.B. Yeats whose Collected Works had only just begun to emerge from what might be termed his 'Celtic Mystic' phase. Poetry was essentially literary, which Ford deplored since "the moment a medium becomes literary, it is remote from the life of the people, it is dulled, languishing, moribund and at last dead"² It is unfair to categorize all Edwardian poetry thus, and to assume that Victorian influences were necessarily stultifying, but the fact remains that of the great quantities of verse published in the Edwardian period, a great deal of it is virtually unreadable. As T.S. Eliot observed, "the situation of poetry in 1909 or 1910 was stagnant to a degree difficult for any young poet of today to imagine."³

The role of The English Review in presenting new concepts of the nature and function of poetry and in publishing new kinds of poetry will be discussed in Chapter 7, but it does seem that changes in poetry written in English began to manifest themselves in the years when Ford was in charge of the review. There are several strands to these changes. The first was the arrival of Ezra Pound in England in 1908, and his meetings in 1909 with F.S. Flint and other poets who later became known as Imagists. This is not the place to

¹ Frank Swinnerton, The Georgian Literary Scene: A Panorama (London: 1935), p. 199.

² Ford to Lucy Masterman, Jan. 23, 1912, in MacShane, p. 154.

³ Literary Essays of Ezra Pound, ed. with an Introduction by T.S. Eliot (London: 1954), p. xiii.

rehearse the history of Imagism¹, nor to discuss the claims of F.S.Flint, T.E.Hulme or Pound to have introduced its ideas. But the principles of the new poetry were direct treatment of the poem's subject, absolute brevity of language and close attention to the rhythms of speech and music. The result was a poetry which was harder, shorter, more compact, yet emotionally more intense. Pound also exercised a considerable influence on other practising poets, notably on Yeats, who was willing to accept Pound's criticisms of some of his verbal excesses.

At the same time as the 'Imagists' were writing, the young D.H.Lawrence was also producing his first poetry, some of which Ford published in The English Review. Lawrence's poetry also represented something new, and is remarkable for its apparent casualness and colloquial ease. He had, as Ezra Pound put it, "attempted realism and ... attained it. He has brought contemporary verse up to the level of contemporary prose."² Lawrence's poetry satisfied Ford's desire for a poetry that should be conversational, and although he used different means from the Imagists, he, too, attacked the 'literariness' of Edwardian poetry.

The third strand in the transformation of English poetry, and the one which received most attention at the time, was the publication of the first anthology of Georgian Poetry 1911-1912, which sold 15,000 copies. Although it first appeared two years after Ford had left the review, it needs to be mentioned here since several of its poets had also been chosen by Ford for inclusion in his periodical. The aim of the editor, Edward Marsh, was to provide a forum for new writers and to support the belief "that English poetry is now once

¹ Chapter 3 of John Press' A Map of English Verse provides a short and lucid account of Imagism.

² Ezra Pound, 'Review of Love Poems and Others by D.H.Lawrence', Poetry, 11, July 1913, 4.

again putting on a new strength and beauty."¹ None of the poets in this first anthology, who included W.H.Davies, Rupert Brooke, Walter de la Mare, John Masefield, John Drinkwater and D.H.Lawrence, was writing in the Imagist mode, but many of them offered the kind of accessible, relaxed poetry which Ford advocated. The poetry of James Elroy Flecker, T.Sturge Moore and James Stephens was arguably more 'literary' and remote and closer to the kind of poetry which Ford theoretically deplored, though generally this first volume of Georgian poetry represents an attempt to present poetry which would reach a far wider audience than had hitherto been achieved. Its success can be measure by the fact that it went into a third edition within two months of being published.

The extent of Ford's literary contacts has been described in Chapter 1; to these can be added some additional contacts available to him during his English Review years which came through a whole set of overlapping cultural networks. One of the most important of these contacts was Edward Garnett, whose family had known Ford's since they were children, and who was familiar through his work in publishing and reviewing, with many contemporary writers. When he began work as a reader for Duckworth's in 1901, Garnett gave Tuesday lunches at the Mont Blanc restaurant in Gerrard Street; in the years up to the outbreak of the Great War, regular attenders, in addition to Ford, included Hilaire Belloc, Joseph Conrad, Norman Douglas, John Galsworthy, W.H.Hudson, John Masefield, Stephen Reynolds, Edward Thomas and H.M.Tomlinson, all English Review contributors. Garnett also invited writers to his house, The Cearne, at Limpsfield Chart on the Surrey Kent border, where Ford was for a time a neighbour and a regular visitor. Garnett was a long standing friend of W.B.Yeats and also established warm relations with a number of Russian exiles, one of whom taught Russian to Edward's wife, Constance. It was Constance

¹ Georgian Poetry 1911-1912, ed. Edward Marsh (London: 1912), Prefatory Note.

who provided Ford with translations of the Russian works which appeared in the review.

In addition to having access to Garnett's wide range of literary contacts, Ford was also a member of the Square Club, founded in 1908 by Conol O'Riordan and G.K.Chesterton to honour Henry Fielding; Ford apparently talked little, but sat "listening and surveying the literary friends of his callow youth with a sinister and mocking wariness."¹ Other members included John Galsworthy, Perceval Gibbon, Walter de la Mare, John Masefield, Henry Nevison and Edward Thomas. While Ford himself was most definitely not a socialist, he had joined the Fabian Society briefly early in 1906, to help H.G.Wells in his unsuccessful campaign to oust some of the long established Fabians such as the Webbs, the Blands and G.B.Shaw. This, and his friendship with H.G.Wells and A.R.Orage, the editor of The New Age, gave him contact with a number of Fabian thinkers and writers, while his affair with Violet Hunt introduced him to a number of prominent women writers, such as May Sinclair and the young Rebecca West, which sustained his support for the suffragette movement. His friendship with C.F.G.Masterman, together with his relationship with his Russian brother-in-law, David Soskice, gave him access to Liberal political circles.

The only major omission in Ford's network of cultural contacts while he was editing The English Review was the circle which met at 46, Gordon Square, the home of the Stephens children, and generally known as the Bloomsbury group, though this can perhaps be explained by the fact that in the years 1908 to 1910 its concerns were more with the visual arts and with design than with literature;² Ford, despite having written three books on artists as a young man, was always more concerned with literature than with any other art

¹ Memories of an Edwardian, p.138.

² See, for example, John Beer, 'The 'Civilisation' of Bloomsbury' in The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, ed. Boris Ford, Vol.8, The Edwardian Age and the Inter-War Years (Cambridge:1989).

form.¹ Bloomsbury apart, Ford's network of contacts, together with his own work as novelist and poet, placed him in an excellent position to keep in touch with most of the cultural and many of the social developments of the day.

These contacts were further enhanced by his own journalism. His poetry and short stories had appeared steadily in a wide range of periodicals since 1891, and from 1906, he was making regular contributions to The Tribune and wrote a series of 'Literary Portraits' for the Books Supplement of The Daily Mail.² Ford was, in fact, in an excellent position to understand the operations of cultural journalism and this, combined with his range of contacts, appeared to place him in an excellent position to launch his own cultural journal to chart and articulate some of the uncertainties of the Edwardian age. However, as the next chapter shows, Ford seems not to have considered seriously what else was available in the field of contemporary cultural journalism, nor to have learned any lessons from the careers, whether successful or failed, of the range of cultural journals which were available to him as possible models.

¹ The three books were Ford Madox Brown, (1896), Rossetti (1902) and Hans Holbein (1905).

² These are charted in Harvey, pp.139-161.

The increase in the number of newspapers and readers already outlined, was to some extent reflected in new cultural journalistic ventures, particularly in the last decade of the nineteenth century. Peter Keating identifies two distinct strands in this expansion.¹ The first was in general interest popular journals such as The Strand Magazine (1891) or Pearson's Magazine (1896), which were lavishly illustrated, often with photographs, and contained news about authors and some reviews. The other was the publication of journals such as The Bookman (1891) and The Times Literary Supplement (1902) solely concerned with books. Keating places this second strand in the context of a general growth in the literary industry with increasing use of literary agents and the appearance of a number of books about how to become a published author.² Despite this increase in journalistic activity, some of which was challenging and innovative, there does seem to have been some feeling at the time that Edwardian journalism was in the doldrums. Ford himself complained that "the majority of our journals are written by shop-boys for shop-girls ... and directed by advertising managers for the benefit of shopkeepers",³ though this opinion, expressed in 1911, may be coloured by losing control of his own review twelve months earlier. Arnold Bennett launched a savage attack on contemporary journalism in April, 1908, asserting that English periodicals were "on the whole the most stupid and infantile of any world power, the United States not excepted," and went on to claim that "it is notorious, of course, that from all the unpretending magazines ideas less than fifty years

¹ The Haunted Study, p.34.

² *Ibid.*, p.42.

³ Ancient Lights, p. 169.

old are banned."¹ Bennett's outburst may seem to suggest that the time was ripe for the launching of a new periodical such as The English Review and that most quarterly and monthly magazines were moribund. Certainly some of them, including the more serious journals, had been around for a very long time, The Edinburgh Review since 1802, for example, and The Athenaeum since 1828. However since Bennett's protest appeared in The New Age, itself one of the liveliest periodicals available, it may be little more than an advertisement for what Bennett saw as his own cultural enlightenment.

Quarterlies

Not surprisingly, given both their history and their length, the extant nineteenth century quarterlies were ponderous productions. For example, The Quarterly Review, still published by John Murray at six shillings a copy, and edited in 1908 by G.W. Prothero, consisted entirely of reviews, often quite lengthy, of books and other publications, such as Parliamentary reports. A single issue was about 300 pages long, and its reviews, usually signed, were grouped under a dozen or so headings which were as likely to be historical or political as literary. A list of the contents for January 1909 will perhaps suggest its scope. These were: The Value of the Territorial Force, Religion and Empire in Ancient Egypt, Sweated Industry and the Minimum Wage, The Foundation of the Third Republic, Herodotus and the Historian, The Public and the Motor Car, (an appeal for legislation to control it), Milton and Dante - A Comparison and Contrast, The Control of the Feeble-Minded, A New Departure in English Poetry, (a review by Henry Newbolt of Hardy's The Dynasts), The Works of Anthony Trollope, The Reforming Turk, Truth and Fiction in Irish History and Women's Suffrage. The range of topics is impressively wide, the approach

¹ New Age, April 25, 1908, 513.

solid and scholarly, and its position conservative. The comments on women's suffrage demonstrate both the authoritative tone and entrenched position which characterised the review. "Our purpose in this article is to make women's suffrage the subject of calm argument ... and then to insist upon the conclusion ... that a revolution of such boundless significance cannot be attempted without the greatest peril to England."¹

The Edinburgh Review also sold for six shillings and again, consisted entirely of reviews; the corresponding volume for January 1909, contained reviews of books under a similar wide range of topics - The Holland House Circle, Victorian Chancellors, Tariff Revisions, A School of Irish Poetry (on Yeats), The Venetian Republic, and reviews of books on hunting, Roman art, evolution and Scottish local history. While it was rather more in favour of reform than The Quarterly Review, its format was even more oppressive, with small print, densely packed pages and no advertising. Neither review made any concessions to the reader in terms of attractive lay-out, and the absence of any creative work presumed a highly educated readership with a wide range of academic interests.

However, not all nineteenth century quarterlies were cast in the same mould; the need for an alternative had been felt as early as the last decade of the nineteenth century. The aim of The Yellow Book, which first appeared in April 1894, was "to provide an Illustrated Magazine which shall be as beautiful as a piece of bookmaking, modern and distinguished in its letter-press and its pictures and withal popular in the better sense of the word. It is felt that such a Magazine, at present, is conspicuous by its absence."² The challenge to the conventional quarterly is unmistakeable with its emphasis on appearance, popularity and

¹ Quarterly Review, 210, Jan. 1909, 276-277.

² Announcement, cited in British Literary Magazines: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837-1913, ed. Alvin Sullivan (Westpoint, Connecticut: 1984), p.457.

illustration, though it too, was aimed at an educated and cultured audience; its price of five shillings, as well as its book length and distinguished yellow hard covers, ensured that. It was published by John Lane at Bodley Head, the editor was Henry Harland and its art editor Aubrey Beardsley for the first four issues. After this he was asked to leave the editorial staff because he had become associated in people's minds, if not in fact, with the trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895,¹ and thus with decadence. The Times, for example, criticised The Yellow Book for "a combination of English randiness with French lubricity."² Today The Yellow Book seems staid enough, but it is easy to see that it may have appeared startling to a readership weaned on The Quarterly and Edinburgh Reviews.

The Yellow Book contained no reviews, though there were publishers' announcements; the contents consisted entirely of original writing and art. Literary contributors to its thirteen issues included Henry James, Richard le Gallienne, Max Beerbohm, A.C.Benson, George Saintsbury, Austin Dobson, Arthur Symons, Edmund Gosse, Richard Garnett, George Moore, Kenneth Grahame, Lionel Johnson, George Gissing, Ella D'Arcy and E. Nesbit. Artists, whose work was beautifully reproduced and protected by tissue paper overlays, included Beardsley himself, Frederick Leighton, Walter Sickert, Walter Crane, John Sargent and Wilson Steer. No reason was given for ceasing publication, though it had almost certainly ceased to be profitable. Ford believed that it was Wilde who "brought down the Yellow Book,"³ while Katherine Mix blames the loss of Beardsley as illustrator

¹ Newspaper headlines are often cited as proclaiming 'Arrest of Oscar Wilde, Yellow Book Under his Arm'. Wilde was dropped from the Bodley Head list, and because Beardsley was associated with him in the public mind, he was removed from his position after a campaign against him by a group of Bodley Head authors. This is discussed briefly in The Yellow Book 1894-1897 : Notes for an Exhibition at Cambridge University Library April-June 1994, with an index to the literary contributions by S.J.Hills (Cambridge: 1994), p.15.

² The Times, April 20, 1894, 3.

³ Return to Yesterday, p.45.

and cover designer for its failure.¹ The high standard of production and the distinguished list of contributors, which compares favourably with the contributors found by Ford for The English Review, would have made it expensive to produce and this cost was not offset by any advertising revenue. Its scope was less wide than The English Review, but it was culturally more coherent, refusing forays into criticism and current affairs; certainly, it was a pioneer in innovative cultural journalism.

A rival to The Yellow Book appeared very quickly in the form of The Savoy. This, too, began as a quarterly in January 1896, under the editorship of Arthur Symons, and Beardsley was recruited after his recent sacking from The Yellow Book. Like The Yellow Book, The Savoy aimed to be "a periodical of an exclusively literary and artistic kind,"² though unlike The Yellow Book, it published penetrating articles of literary criticism, such as Havelock Ellis on Zola and Nietzsche, and W.B. Yeats on Blake, with a reproduction of one of Blake's pictures showing a male nude which caused W.H. Smith to ban the periodical from its bookstalls! In the light of Ford's own claims for The English Review, (to be considered in detail in Chapter 6) it is perhaps worth quoting Arthur Symons' intentions for The Savoy. "We hope to appeal to the tastes of the intelligent by not being original for originality's sake, or timid for the convenience of the elderly minded. We intend to put into print no verse which has not some close relationship with poetry, no fiction which has not a certain sense of what is finest in living fact, no criticism which has not some knowledge, discernment and sincerity."³ While Ford might have wanted Symons to define poetry, there is little here from which he would have dissented in terms of

¹ Mix, Katherine Lyon, A Study in Yellow: The Yellow Book and Its Contributors (Lawrence: 1960), p.274.

² Savoy, Editorial Note, 1, Jan. 1896.

³ Ibid.

editorial principle.

It was an altogether shorter publication than the book length Yellow Book, and after the first two numbers, became a monthly, appearing last in December 1896. It failed, as Symons said, because it gave "so much for so little money," (half a crown for the quarterly, two shillings for the monthly), because of the W.H.Smith's ban, and because he had assumed, wrongly, "that there were very many people in the world who really cared for art, and really for art's sake."¹ This, too, is remarkably Fordian in its sentiments, and the career of The Savoy in many ways prefigures that of The English Review under Ford, though like The Yellow Book, it has a narrower, yet sharper cultural focus. It was lively, intelligent, ambitious and concerned with standards, and the level of achievement for its two quarterly and six monthly issues was astonishingly high. Its contributions included work by George Bernard Shaw, Ernest Dowson, W.B. Yeats (both prose and poetry), Max Beerbohm (prose and illustrations), translations of French poetry by Arthur Symons and George Moore, a tribute to Verlaine by Edmund Gosse, poems as well as illustrations by Beardsley, woodcuts by William Horton and other illustrations by Joseph Pennell and Whistler. The August number also included Ford's 'The Song of the Women - A Wealden Trio', only the third time his poetry had appeared in print.

There was a third late Victorian cultural quarterly, The Dome, though like The Savoy, it quickly became a monthly. Financed and edited by Ernest Oldmeadow, who owned the Unicorn Press, it was 'An Illustrated Magazine and Review of Literature, Music, Architecture and the Graphic Arts'; it ran from March 1897 to July 1900 and sold for one shilling. Its cultural scope was actually wider than that of The Yellow Book and The

¹ Ibid., 8, Dec 1896, 92.

Savoy. For example, the musical content included not simply articles about composers such as Wagner by Arthur Symons and a study of Paderewski by 'Israfel', but musical scores for a song by Delius, and another with words by W.B. Yeats and music by Thomas Dunhill. W.B. Yeats also contributed a number of articles, including a plea for poetic drama (April 1899), a note on the Irish Literary Theatre (January 1900), 'Symbolism in Modern Poetry' (April 1900), and 'The Philosophy of Shelley's Poetry' (May 1900). Art alternated with prose and poetry throughout, and the artwork included reproductions of the work of Ford Madox Brown, D.G. Rossetti, Michelangelo, Millet, Dürer, Rembrandt, Watteau and Blake. The drawings and woodcuts were impressively reproduced, though the black and white copies of original oil paintings were obviously less effective. Other contributors included Laurence Binyon, Laurence Houseman, Roger Fry (on Bellini) and Frances Thompson.

The Dome, The Yellow Book and The Savoy provide an impressive record of late Victorian culture and responses to it, as well as possible models for Ford to use, while The Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews show the kind of periodical tradition which Ford and others felt had to be broken. Ford also had the examples of new twentieth century quarterlies to draw upon, two of which were devoted exclusively to cultural matters. The Acorn, which described itself as 'An Illustrated Quarterly Magazine devoted to Literature and Art' in fact appeared only twice, in 1905 and 1906. Lavishly produced and illustrated, The Acorn looked exclusive though it cost only half a crown. Many contributions appeared under facsimiles of the authors' signatures while art work included etchings by Frank Brangwyn, ornaments and initial letters by H.G. Webb, and a photograph portrait of Percy Grainger to illustrate an article by Constance Smedley on 'The Young British School of Composers'. W.B. Yeats and G.K. Chesterton each contributed a poem to the first number, while A.C. Benson provided a short story and John Todhunter an article about Watteau. However, much of the poetry and prose was precious and pretentious, and the whole

project had the air of artistic exclusivity.

This is even more true of Neolith, which appeared three times between November 1907 and August 1908 and was directed by E.Nesbit, Granly Hewitt, F.E.Jackson and Spenser Pryse. It was only 28 pages long and had print which looked like the most superior kind of calligraphy. Its contents are perhaps more interesting than those of The Acorn - short stories by G.B.Shaw, E. Nesbit, Lord Dunsany and Laurence Houseman, drawings, some in colour, by Frank Brangwyn and Walter Sickert and a portrait in crayon of A.R.Orage, editor of The New Age, an article on Thomas Bewick's landscapes by Selwyn Image and a dramatic satire called 'Neolith Decadence' by Andrew Lang. Neolith assumed a restricted audience of like minded sensitive souls and did not engage at all with contemporary issues, even of a cultural kind, though Edgar Jepson, who witnessed the launch of both Neolith and The English Review felt that the former was the "forerunner of the revival of literature at the end of the Edwardian Age."¹

One other new quarterly is worth mentioning here. The New Quarterly, a 'Review of Science and Literature', published by Dent at half a crown and edited by Desmond MacCarthy, ran from November 1907 to May 1910. It began as a genuine attempt to provide a journal which crossed cultural boundaries and the first issues at least, alternated articles on science and the humanities. For example, in the first issue, a discussion of Baudelaire by T.Sturge Moore was preceded by an article called 'Can We Detect our Drift through Space?' by Hon. R.J.Strutt, F.R.S., and followed by 'Biology and Politics' by G.A.Paley. In March 1908, an article on Earth Tides was followed by one on John Donne by the editor, while in October 1909, H.Granville Barker's article on repertory theatres was

¹ Memories of an Edwardian, p.100.

sandwiched between 'Galileo and the Tercentenary of the Telescope' by H.H.Turner, F.R.S., and 'On the Tidal Retardation of the Earth and the Relation to Geologic Time' by H.S.Skelton. While the proportion of scientific articles clearly diminished in 1909 and vanished altogether from the last two numbers in 1910, The New Quarterly was unusual in its assumption that its readers could cope with intelligent discussion of such diverse topics. Science and technology were becoming increasingly specialised and incomprehensible to the layperson, but The New Quarterly assumed an intelligent response to sciences as well as arts and its contributors were as distinguished on the scientific as on the cultural side. They included Bertrand Russell, Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S., J.S.Haldane, F.R.S., Arthur Symons, Hilaire Belloc, G.K.Chesterton, H.G.Wells (on socialism) Robert Bridges, Roger Fry (on aesthetics) and Chekhov in translation. It also serialised the Samuel Butler Notebooks. There is no indication given in its last issues of its impending closure, although a four month gap in publication between October 1909 and February 1910, and the total absence of scientific articles in 1910 suggest that The New Quarterly was in difficulties and was perhaps trying to overcome them by a change in editorial policy. It was not in direct competition with The English Review, since it assumed a range of scientific interests which Ford, almost the archetypal liberal humanist, abhorred. But its existence as a contemporary of The English Review does suggest that not all periodical journalism was, as Arnold Bennett claimed, "stupid and infantile." Other editors apart from Ford were engaged in producing intelligent and progressive discussion of the Edwardian world.

Monthlies

The most common form of publication for the Edwardian magazine was the monthly. Some of the best known monthlies had been major nineteenth century publications; the oldest,

The Westminster Review, was founded in 1824, though it had been a quarterly until 1887. However, while publications such as The Westminster Review, The Contemporary Review, The National Review and The Nineteenth Century and After, provided the opportunity for the airing of some of the important contemporary political and social issues, their cultural content was small. Three monthlies which survived from the Victorian period did have a considerable literary content; these were The Fortnightly Review, (which despite its title had been a monthly since 1866), The Cornhill Magazine and Blackwoods Edinburgh Magazine or 'Maga' as it was affectionately known.

The Fortnightly, founded in 1865 under the editorship of G.H.Lewes, was, by 1908, the most distinguished and wide ranging of the three, and its position was very often close to that taken by The English Review. Many of its articles engaged with contemporary issues such as female suffrage, which it supported, (August and September 1908) German military aggrandisement, which it opposed (July 1908) and a whole section each month called 'Foreign Affairs: a Chronique', which provided extensive coverage of political events in many countries. There were articles about international intellectual influences; in July 1908, for example, Yves Guyot wrote on 'The Influence of English Thought on the French Mind' and J.B.Crozier discussed 'A Challenge to Socialism - A Dialogue with Marx'. There were frequent articles on literary topics, such as an appreciation of Mark Rutherford and a discussion of Tolstoy and Tolstoyans in August 1908. In December of that year there was a long survey of plays for the new season by William Archer, a plea for an endowed theatre in London by Sir John Hankin and an appreciation of Milton on the tercentenary of his birth, while in May 1909, Edmund Gosse wrote an appreciation of Swinburne after his death the preceding month. The Fortnightly also published original work. In addition to the serialisation of Elizabeth Robins' The Mills of the Gods between July 1908 and June 1909, works by Turgenev and Tolstoy in translation, fiction by May Sinclair, Violet Hunt

and Charles Marriott and poetry by Alfred Noyes and Laurence Binyon appeared. While The Fortnightly did not publish as much original work as The English Review, it was nevertheless a review which rated culture highly, and its mix of political, social and cultural commentary is not dissimilar.

Arnold Bennett reserved his most scathing criticism of monthly periodicals for The Cornhill Magazine, saying that it stood "for all that is worst in the British temperament. It is a sponge-cake of well-bred recollections, essays on gardens and Shakespeare, and the introspections of anaemic and tailored persons who have withdrawn from the real world ... Save possibly Harpers, the Cornhill is the most desolating magazine that I have ever abandoned in a first class compartment."¹ Bennett was rather hard on The Cornhill. It is true that it contained a higher proportion of serialised works, whether fiction or autobiography, than any other periodical in 1908, and that its fiction was unremarkable, but it did have several distinguished contributors. Virginia Stephens, (later Woolf,) provided a number of book reviews in 1908 and 1909, while A.C.Benson contributed to a series linking writers with places - Edward Fitzgerald with Woodbridge and Jane Austen with Lyme Regis. There was poetry by Thomas Hardy, Wilfred Wilson Gibson and Henry Newbolt. What The Cornhill did not provide was any kind of guide to or comment on contemporary matters, cultural or otherwise. There was no editorial and, apart from occasional articles on 'The Moderate Motorist' and 'Ruskin College: An Educational Experiment', there was little to indicate that the periodical was actually in the twentieth century.

Bennett was marginally less hostile to Blackwoods Magazine than to The Cornhill.

¹ New Age, April 25, 1908, 513.

Although he called it "an uncouth, rude and sometimes offensive bundle," he allowed that it was possible to respect it on the grounds that "in Scotland, whatever their manners, they do read."¹ In fact, in 1908 and 1909, the two magazines had a number of similarities, particularly in the quantity of serialised fiction and memoirs; Blackwoods did, however, have a stronger military and colonial slant to some of its articles. It did not have even The Cornhill's modest component of literary criticism; Alfred Noyes' 'In Memory of Swinburne' in May 1909 was the sole literary article between July 1908 and June 1909. Although Blackwoods had published a great deal of interesting fiction in the nineteenth century, including work by George Eliot, Anthony Trollope and Joseph Conrad, by the first decade of the twentieth century, it had an old fashioned and tired feel to it, and together with The Cornhill, is an example of the kind of outworn monthly periodical which The English Review hoped to replace.

Some Victorian monthlies had, of course, already folded before The English Review was even thought of; these included The Argosy, which ran from 1866 to 1901, and Longmans and Macmillans Magazines, both of which ceased in October 1905. Two monthlies which failed just before Ford started work on The English Review, while not exclusively concerned with cultural matters, were nevertheless culturally interesting, and their demise may have created a gap in the market which The English Review was able to fill. The Monthly Review was started by John Murray in 1900 with Henry Newbolt as editor, though he resigned in 1904 over the issue of free trade and was replaced by Charles Hanbury Williams. It folded in October 1907 because of poor circulation, but in its short life published work by W.B. Yeats, H.G. Wells, Thomas Hardy, Walter de la Mare, Edward Garnett, Andrew Lang, W.H. Hudson and Roger Fry. Unlike The Cornhill and Blackwoods

¹ Ibid.

Magazines, The Monthly Review maintained its high standards to the end; in the last three months, it contained work by Maxim Gorki, by Arthur Symonds on John Clare and 'Great Acting in English', a discussion of Hardy's literary techniques by Lindsay Garrett and an article by Orage on 'Discipline in Elementary Schools'. It was an earnest, but interesting periodical, liberal in outlook, with a small but high quality literary content.

The other failed monthly was Edwardian rather than Victorian. Beginning life as The Independent Review in 1903, it became The Albany Review in April 1907, shortly after John Lane took over its publishing from Fisher Unwin. Its editor was Charles Roden Buxton and it cost half a crown. Like The Monthly Review, it was a general rather than a specifically literary periodical, though every issue contained at least one article on a literary topic - Desmond MacCarthy on 'The Irony of Samuel Butler' and a discussion of Shakespeare's Iago by W.H.Hadow in July 1908, for example, and F.M.Stavell on 'The Poems of Mary Coleridge' in August. It contained very little fiction and only the occasional poem such as R.C.K. Ensor's sentimental 'Ode to Summer' in July 1908. Both articles and book review engaged fully in important contemporary issues. Each side of the suffragette movement was extensively debated, as were proposals for old age pensions and a range of European movements. The list of contributors to The Albany Review during its short life is very impressive; they include C.F.G. Masterman, Bertrand Russell, Maxim Gorki, Ramsay MacDonald, Sidney Webb, Thomas Hardy, Hilaire Belloc, G.K. Chesterton, Gilbert Murray, Stephen Reynolds, Henry Nevinson, John Galsworthy and E.M. Forster. It cannot compare with The English Review in terms of its literary content, but it is similar in the quality and range of its other contributions. It ceased publication in September 1908 for what it simply called 'financial reasons', though several of its writers, including the last eight in the list above, were able to place work in Ford's new journal. Although its demise left a hole which The English Review could partly fill, its fate, like that of other quality

periodicals before it, did not bode well for new ventures.

Two of the monthlies which *were* still being published when The English Review began, were of late Victorian origin. The Review of Reviews which began in 1890, was originally intended as a monthly supplement to The Pall Mall Gazette, but it was purchased and edited by W.T. Stead until his death on the Titanic. Keating describes it as "the review for the man who didn't have time to read the reviews."¹ It was, in fact, a kind of potted guide to the views expressed by all the leading periodicals of the day, with summaries of leading articles, a set of 'Random Readings from the Reviews', 'Topics of the Day in Periodicals of the Month', which was a kind of index to which periodical had written about what, and a section called 'The Reviews Reviewed', which, as its title suggests, was an assessment of the achievements of periodicals in a given month. It also contained a diary and obituaries for each month and extensive book reviews, as well as articles on relevant social issues; Stead was an ardent supporter of female suffrage, poor law reform and Irish Home Rule. Surprisingly, its coverage of The English Review was thin. It wasn't mentioned at all under 'Review of Reviews' although established periodicals such as The Cornhill and Blackwoods Magazines and The Contemporary and Fortnightly Reviews were all considered regularly. The first reference to The English Review came in March 1909, under the 'Leading Articles' heading, where the review's opinions on Turkish politicians were summarised, and there were further brief references to articles published in the review in April. The Review of Reviews can hardly be called a literary magazine; it published no fiction or poetry, its book reviews were seldom on literary topics and there is no attempt to focus on cultural issues. It was, however, an example of lively, wide-ranging journalism whose views on social and political issues coincided to a marked extent with those

¹ The Haunted Study, p.34.

expressed by The English Review; that it should largely ignore its existence suggests that not all the Edwardian review reading public were impressed by it.

The second of the continuing Victorian monthlies, which began in 1891, a year later than The Review of Reviews, was The Bookman, under the editorship of Sir William Robertson Nicoll. It was a purely literary periodical, unusual in that it was not aimed at a scholarly or academic readership; its price of sixpence, or a shilling for a double number, together with its lavish illustrations, ensured its continuing popularity. Particular issues had sections devoted to individual writers; October 1908, for example, was a Ruskin Double Number, January 1909 a Poe Centenary Number and September 1909 a Dr. Johnson Bi-Centenary Number. These special features were comprehensive and detailed; the Ruskin number contained an article on the Library Edition of his works, together with a discussion of Ruskin's position in the world of art, his role as a social reformer and many examples of his art. There were also other regular monthly features. 'New Notes' contained general literary and publishing gossip, including advance notice of The English Review. "This is a most inviting programme, but the success of the Review will depend quite as much on the choice of subjects as on the choice of contributors."¹ 'Booksellers' Diary' listed forthcoming books by publisher, and 'The Bookman Gallery' was a series of pen portraits of well known figures in the world of books. There were up to twenty pages of substantial book reviews, followed by several pages of shorter notices; Edward Thomas, Arthur Ransome, Stephen Reynolds and Walter de la Mare all reviewed regularly for The Bookman in 1908 and 1909. Its hallmarks were its liveliness and accessibility, the breadth of its coverage both of contemporary writers and writers from the past, and its ability to respond quickly to events of literary importance. The deaths of Swinburne and Meredith

¹Bookman, 35, Oct. 1908, 1.

in April and May 1909, were followed in the next month with a Swinburne number in May and a Meredith one in June. In July 1909, there was a photograph and a brief outline of the life and works of Ezra Pound to accompany a favourable review of his Personae. The Bookman was that rare hybrid, a periodical which was both consistently popular and highly intelligent, and since it was cheap, it could be afforded by readers who might have found the half crown charged by The English Review beyond them.

There were also specialist cultural monthlies, such as The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs, which was a scholarly journal entirely devoted to the fine arts. It has relevance to The English Review in so far as it demonstrates a market for a high class, *intellectually respectable and robust periodical devoted to cultural matters*. If the art world had The Burlington, then poets had Thrush. In fact, two totally unconnected publications appeared under this name in the first decade of the twentieth century. The first, edited by T.Mullett Ellis in 1901 and 1902, had democratic ideals, hoping that "the time may be ripe for the issue of Poetry in a popular form and at a price within the means of the poorest."¹ Certainly at fourpence a copy, it was cheap, but the public didn't get many poems for its money; the April 1901 issue was unusual in having as many as ten poems, since in some months it was down to three! This first Thrush also suffered from an overdose of a belief in poetry simply as a source of beauty and elevated thoughts. It was "intended to bring thoughts of beauty and the consolation of exalted ideas into the hearts of the people,"² which perhaps explains why most of the poetry was so appalling.

The later Thrush, which first appeared in December 1909, was a more substantial and

¹ Preface, Thrush, Jan.1901.

² Advertisement, *Ibid.*, Aug.1901.

professional affair, though it only ran for six months. Its editors, Noel Wells and Walter Jerrold, deplored "the prevailing spirit of apathy with regard to poetry" and felt that poetry was necessary to enable us "to survive the stultifying conditions of modern life." Thus far Ford might have agreed with them, but their feeling that poetry should "discover and make permanent the particular beauties which are latent in every age",¹ led the magazine to publish mostly turgid romantic poetry, full of twilight, love, moonlight and sorrow. The impressive thing about the later magazine was its prose, including Ford himself on 'Modern Poetry'. Poetry would occur, he argued, "when young poets get it into their heads to come out of their book-closets and take, as it were, a walk down Fleet Street, or a ride on the top of a 'bus from Shepherd's Bush to Poplar." Sadly, few of the poets whose work appeared in The Thrush appeared to have taken Ford's advice, or to have looked with "inquiring, sincere and properly humble eyes upon the life that is around him [sic]."² Other prose included a thoughtful discussion of Henry James by Frank Swinnerton in December 1909, and an article by Francis Bickley on 'The Development of William Butler Yeats' in January 1910. There were also sympathetic reviews of Pound's Exultations in March 1910 and of Ford's Songs from London in April. In the context of Ford's attacks on the lack of critical attitude which he voiced in The English Review, perhaps the most interesting prose contribution to The Thrush is an article by W. Thomas Colyer, attacking the superficiality, ignorance, caution and partisanship of journalists and readers alike. He argued the need for risk taking: "The men who will not take the risk of making mistakes, will never make anything else."³ Later in the same article he wrote that the solution lay "in the possibility

¹ Introductory Note, Thrush, Dec. 1909, 1.

² Ford, 'Modern Poetry', *Ibid.*, 52-53.

³ W. Thomas Colyer, 'Some Reflections on Modern Journalism', *Ibid.*, Feb. 1910, 221.

of arousing the public to an attitude of keen criticism"¹, a solution which Ford himself advocated in his review and repeated in The Critical Attitude. Colyer's article shows that Ford was not entirely the lone voice crying in a cultural wilderness which he sometimes claimed to be.

The remaining English popular monthlies, Cassell's Magazine, The Pall Mall Magazine, The Strand Magazine, The London Magazine, Pearson's Magazine and The Windsor Magazine are distinguished by little more than their titles. They were all the same size, roughly the same length and the same price, sixpence. All were extensively illustrated, contained a mixture of fiction, humour, gossip and articles of general interest. They were amiable, wholesome and undemanding, though they occasionally published fiction by English Review contributors; short stories by Joseph Conrad and Arnold Bennett appeared in Cassell's Magazine in July 1908, while in the same year The Pall Mall Magazine serialised H.G.Wells' The War in the Air. Wells was already an extremely popular author in 1908, but for Conrad and Bennett, publication in such magazines meant not only publicity, but much needed payment.

Weeklies

In some ways, it was the Edwardian weekly periodicals which provided the most penetrating commentary on the Edwardian cultural and social scene. Some were undoubtedly trivial, such as Tit-Bits, The Bystander and Black and White. Others, continuing from the previous century, had an old-fashioned air about them, including The Athenaeum, Notes and Queries and Chambers Journal. There were, however, a number of

¹ Ibid., 222.

weeklies which were serious reviews of contemporary life and culture. The most outspoken of these was the ultra right wing The Academy, 'A Weekly Review of Literature, Science and Art', under the editorship of Lord Alfred Douglas and costing threepence. It had been started in 1896, but by 1907, when it was sold to Sir Edward Tennant, a rich Liberal M.P. and Asquith's brother-in law, it had become dull and unsuccessful. Under its new editor, Douglas, and his assistant editor, T.W.H.Crosland, The Academy pursued a ruthless high church and Tory line. Its new management made it more lively but also so scurrilous that Tennant gave the paper to Douglas in September 1908 to avoid any personal involvement in the insults and lawsuits which seemed synonymous with The Academy. By 1910, Douglas was forced to relinquish the paper; its finances were in total disarray and it was facing two libel suits.

The libel suits were hardly surprising, since Douglas attacked institutions and individuals with a pen dipped in vitriol, though some of these attacks make for entertaining reading. Commenting on Labour M.P.s being invited to a royal garden party, Douglas wrote, "We ourselves cannot imagine anyone in their senses inviting Mr. Keir Hardie to a garden party."¹ His dislike of suffragettes is revealed in comments such as "the women who make public demonstrations of their hatred of mankind are as a general rule screaming through their hats."² In the same issue, he described H.G.Wells as a "smug, well-fed, well-placed, well-wived, J.P.d, telephoned, Pearson supporting socialist" who "comes wantonly out into the highways and howls for the desecration of other homes than his own, and the spoilation of property that does not happen to be his."³ There is enough truth in the first

¹ Academy, 75, July 4, 1908, 5.

² Ibid., Aug. 22, 1908, 171.

³ Ibid., 182.

part of this tirade to ensure that the reader's sympathies do not go out to Wells wholeheartedly!

Douglas constantly attacked other reviews, although the most sustained and vicious criticism was directed at The English Review and The New Age. His hostility to the first was largely due to the fact that he claimed to have purchased the right to its title. This claim will be discussed fully in the next chapter, but it produced editorial broadsides of which the following is a typical example: "People who want to read the real English Review will buy the Academy ... People on the other hand who think Mr. Shaw a super God, Mr. Wells a great philosopher and Mr. Galsworthy a great novelist, will turn to Messrs. Duckworth's publication and get plenty of New Age variety Socialism, Suffragitis, and red-tied, Soho restaurant bleating."¹ The New Age he hated because of its avowed socialist stance. In fact, Douglas provided a great deal of free, though not entirely welcome publicity for both publications.

Yet despite the viciousness and shrillness of much of its commentary, The Academy under Douglas was a periodical which cared about literary standards and which provided thoughtful and intelligent discussion of literary topics. Douglas, like Ford, fought a constant battle against the commercialism which he felt dominated too many publishing enterprises. "If you wish to discover how insolent a creature of God can really become ... you can safely turn to a certain class of publisher."² Like Ford, he deplored what he perceived to be a general lack of literary standards. "In England at the present moment we

¹ Ibid., Nov. 21, 1908, 484.

² Ibid., July 4, 1908, 14.

have a few writers who may be said to use the fictional convention nobly"¹ He particularly praised May Sinclair's novel, Kitty Tailleur, because " it stands out in marked contrast to the vast mass of puerilities and inanities which today masquerade under the guise of fiction."² Like Ford, Douglas deplored the kind of poetry which many journals published. "The wonderful dullness of the 'poetry' which is nowadays issued from the press cannot be denied."³ And like Ford, Douglas had his literary enthusiasms, sometimes indeed the same enthusiasms - for the language of the King James bible, for the works of Oscar Wilde, Elizabeth Gaskell, Jane Austen, Jonathan Swift, Turgenev and Rudyard Kipling, praising the poet for extending the poetry reading public.⁴ The Academy, under Douglas, was a curiously schizophrenic weekly, ranging from near hysterical antagonism through insufferable superiority to thoughtful and even sensitive insights. It took a keen interest in contemporary life and especially in contemporary literature.

Also politically conservative, though less strident in tone was The Spectator, 'A Weekly Review of Politics, Literature, Theology and Art', edited by J.St.Loe Strachey. At sixpence, it was more expensive than either The Academy or The New Age, but its format was similar to that in other quality weeklies; 'News of the Week', which was paragraphs on contemporary issues, 'Topics of the Day', which were longer articles not confined to current affairs, - for example, on September 12, 1908, this section included an account of the celebrations for Tolstoy's 80th birthday - Letters, Poetry, generally turgid, and extensive book reviews. Once a month there was a survey of opinions expressed by other journals,

¹ Ibid., Aug. 8, 1908, 134.

² Ibid., July 4, 1908, 18.

³ Ibid., Nov. 7, 1908, 439.

⁴ Ibid., Dec. 12, 1908, 561-562.

including, for a time The English Review. Although The Spectator was initially prepared to acknowledge Ford's new review, and indeed, carried four half page advertisements for it between November 1908 and January 1909, its response to The English Review can best be described as snide. It criticised the content of the Hardy poem, 'Sunday Morning Tragedy' which appeared in its first number, thought that the hitherto unpublished Rossetti poem which Ford printed in January 1909 unworthy of him, and found the Granville Barker short story, 'Georgiana', in February, "remarkable only for its offensiveness."¹ In March and April of 1909, The Spectator became involved in an extended and fairly acrimonious argument with The English Review about Belloc's article on censorship, although it was eventually forced to accept the assurances given by The English Review's solicitors that the blacked out portions of Belloc's article did not imply some private scandal.²

Perhaps the most interesting thing about The Spectator in 1908 and 1909 was its book reviewing. The reviews were unsigned but were impressive both for the range of books which they covered and for the thoughtfulness of the opinions which they expressed. For example, the review of Conrad's Set of Six on August 15 1908 was broadened to include a discussion of Conrad's views on anarchism. It provided sympathetic reviews of The Collected Works of W.B. Yeats on October 17, of Stephen Reynolds' A Poor Man's House on November 14, and of A Room with a View on January 2, 1909. And although it was puzzled by the "strange go-as-you please narrative" of Tono-Bungay, The Spectator felt that it was "the most serious attempt at a novel" that H.G. Wells had yet produced.³ The

¹ Spectator, 101, Feb. 6, 1909, 230.

² See Chapter 4 for a fuller discussion of this.

³ Spectator, 101, Feb. 27, 1909, 346.

Spectator also published regular Literary Supplements, and the occasional article on music, theatre and art - a discussion of 'Sir Edward Elgar's Symphony' on January 2, 1909 and of 'Mr. Galsworthy's Plays' on March 25. While it was in no way *avant garde*, The Spectator's literary discussions were wide ranging, thoughtful and up-to-date.

At the opposite end of the political spectrum to The Academy and The Spectator was The New Age, edited by A.R.Orage. The weekly had been purchased by a group of socialists including G.B.Shaw, in 1907, and the first issue was headed 'An Independent Socialist Review of Politics, Literature and Art'. The political emphasis was particularly heavy in its first year when it was edited jointly by Orage, Jackson and Penty, but by 1908, Orage was in overall charge, assisted by Victor Grayson, M.P. as political editor, F.S.Flint as poetry editor, a post he held until 1910, and Arnold Bennett, under the pen name of Jacob Tonson, who contributed a weekly column called 'Books and Persons'.

The New Age rapidly became a kind of clearing house for new ideas and new writers; it was a debating forum, both in the pages of the paper itself and in the regular meetings which accompanied it. Orage insisted on two basic requirements for contributions to The New Age - sincerity and good writing. "Give me a man who writes sincerely and I'll respect his opinions ...That is only one condition; the other is that they [sic] must write well."¹ His editorial principles, already referred to briefly in the Introduction, seem to have been intellectual freedom and breadth of scope, and like Ford, he recognised that it was essential to communicate with the reader. "The criterion, however, in all these things is neither subject nor treatment in the abstract, - but one's relations with one's readers! Provided they are interested, provided they are kept in hot pursuit, anything is permissible.

¹ New Age, 4, Jan. 28, 1909, 280.

Au contraire, nothing is justified in writing that is not read."¹

The New Age published a great deal of literary discussion of the highest quality. Not surprisingly, it praised social realism both in drama and fiction, admiring plays "in which the observation of character and locality is genuine scientific observation"² and publishing translations of the work of Gorki and Chekhov, because they represented social realism at its best. Bennett's weekly 'Books and Persons' column was an excellent forum for discussing the work of new and existing authors, while Flint's discussion centred on *vers libre* and developments in French poetry. He also provided a thoughtful commentary on Pound's Personae in May 1909 and was responsible for introducing both T.H.Hulme and Edward Storer as contributors to The New Age. The paper also printed regular Literary Supplements and was the first periodical to publish work by Flint and Hulme. To anticipate a little, it wrote about the Post Impressionists before the Post Impressionist exhibition of 1910, introduced Bergson and Freud to English readers in 1909 and 1912 respectively, and Pound contributed nearly 200 articles between 1912 and 1922. Since it was also one of the most consistent supporters of the new English Review, it is surprising that Ford was not a contributor.

Unlike Ford, or indeed, Douglas, Orage seems to have been a good financial manager, ensuring that The New Age had adequate financial backing; in its early years, its backers were Lewis Wallace, James Allan and Sir Henry Slessor. Orage also organised a share issue for the New Age Press at the end of 1908, selling 3,300 £1 shares. Writers were rarely paid, though Arnold Bennett, who drove a hard bargain with Orage as well as with

¹ Orage to Herbert Read, Aug.22, 1921, in The New Age under Orage: Chapters in English Cultural History, p.54.

² New Age, 4, June 20, 1908, 158.

Ford, eventually succeeded in extracting a guinea a week for his 'Books and Person' column. Income from sales was never high; The New Age cost a penny when it started, and despite sales of over 22,000 by early 1909, it lost money; the price was raised to threepence in November 1909. However, because its expenditure was carefully controlled, The New Age did not struggle like The English Review under Ford, Orage husbanding its resources with great care and securing adequate financial sponsorship before a crisis arose.

There was nothing particularly innovative about the format of The New Age. As in many of its contemporaries, there were editorial comments on events of the week, articles on a wide range of social and political issues, literary reviews, some poetry and an unusually lively correspondence section. What was unusual was the editorial coherence which made The New Age into such a powerful intellectual force, and the strength of its belief that the socialism which it endorsed could transform both culture and society. Moreover, Orage was able to stay in charge of The New Age until October 1922, when he resigned to become a disciple of Gurdjieff, and although the paper changed and developed over the years, it was stamped with Orage's personality far more permanently than anything Ford was able to achieve in his short tenure as editor of The English Review.

Some of the weeklies had fairly chequered careers. The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art had been a highly successful Victorian publication, particularly under the ownership and editorship of Frank Harris between 1894 and 1898. Harris sold The Saturday Review in 1898 and under the editorship of Harold Hodge, it went into a slow decline. In 1908 it was still able to attract distinguished contributors - Max Beerbohm as drama critic, Arthur Symonds and later Filson Young as music critics and Laurence Binyon as art critic. Other regular contributors included Edward Thomas, Cunninghame-Graham, and W.H.Hudson. From February 6 1909, The Saturday Review published

Turgenev's German letters which appeared for five consecutive weeks and on March 6, also published a translation of a Maupassant short story. It published fewer reviews than The Spectator and was less concerned with contemporary issues, though it too was hostile to the suffragette movement.

The Nation had begun life in 1899 as The Speaker, 'A Review of Politics, Letters, Science and The Arts', becoming The Nation in 1907. Edited by Hugh Massingham, it was liberal in attitude, engaging in its editorials and articles with most of the important issues of the day - German rearmament, the poor law, old age pensions and female suffrage - and on May 1 and May 8 1909, it published an 'Open letter on Solitary Confinement to the Home Secretary' by John Galsworthy. While politics was its main concern, its cultural contents were also impressive, including original poetry and prose by writers such as W.B. Yeats, John Drinkwater and W.H. Davies. Its reviewing was of a very high standard; regular reviewers included Henry Nevinson, G.K. Chesterton and William Archer, the latter as drama critic; Ford was invited to review The Family Letters of Christina Rossetti on January 2 1909. In a 'Special Poetry and Fiction number' on July 11 1908, in an article called 'The Outlook for English Fiction', The Nation singled out Conrad, Galsworthy, Wells and Hardy for special praise, and like Ford in The English Review, wanted fiction to engage with the real world. "Dare we hope for an unflinching gaze at the realities of life, from the younger school of writers?"¹ It also enthused about A Room with a View - "Mr. Forster has earned the right to serious criticism"² - about Ford's Half Moon, which it reckoned was the best thing he had written³, and about Tono-Bungay. Unusually for a

¹ Nation, 3, July 11, 1908, 536.

² Ibid., 4, Nov. 28, 1908, 352.

³ Ibid., 5, April 24, 1909, 136.

review written in 1909, The Nation recognised that the fragmentary structure of Wells' narrative reflected the fragmented nature of contemporary life. "It is a confusion because modern life is a confusion. It passes as a series of episodes, random and disconnected, because all experience which is not numbed by custom or hedged into irrevocable routine must necessarily be random and disconnected in such a tumultuous, fragmentary world."¹ The Nation was enthusiastic about The English Review; it was an intelligent and responsive weekly and far less stuffy than The Spectator.

Outlook, 'A Weekly Review of Politics, Art, Literature and Finance', also had a varied career. It had begun life as The New Review in 1889, becoming Outlook in 1898.² Its political range and tone were similar to that of The Nation, though with the addition of a short section called 'Finance of the Week'. Its cultural content was smaller, but the general level of comment was informed and intelligent; very few of its articles were signed. There were perceptive reviews of Ford's Mr. Apollo on August 29 1908,³ of Tono-Bungay on February 20 1909 and of Masterman's The Condition of England on June 12.⁴

The Times Literary Supplement, begun in 1902, was different from other weeklies in that, as its title suggests, it was solely concerned with books. Its major function was reviewing, though there were regular articles on literary topics and correspondence on literary matters. It was ponderous in tone, fairly conservative in approach, not prone to enthusiasm and much given to the royal 'we'; in this sense, it was very different from the much more

¹ Ibid., 4, Feb 13, 1909, 758.

² The editor in 1908 is not named in the weekly itself, and is not given in the standard work of reference, British Literary Magazines: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837 -1913, ed Sullivan.

³ I am grateful to Max Saunders who points out that this review was in fact written by Edward Garnett, citing a letter from Ford to Garnett in the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Centre, University of Texas.

⁴ Ford was a regular contributor to Outlook from September 1913 to August 1915.

lively Bookman. It was, however, equally wide ranging and provides a valuable guide to mainstream Edwardian literary taste. For example, it was only faintly praising of Conrad's Set of Six, of Mr. Apollo and A Room with a View, and while it welcomed Tono-Bungay, it was clearly worried that the novel could not be easily categorised. Masterman's The Condition of England, however, was praised in glowing terms, and a review of the New York edition of The Novels of Henry James stated that the novelist "is in every sense of the word a true impressionist."¹

It is worth referring briefly to one other publication, which was more of an anthology than a periodical. Calling itself 'An Annual of Art and Literature', Venture appeared only twice, in 1903 and 1905, the first issue edited by Laurence Houseman and Somerset Maughan and the second by John Baillie. It was published in book form, price five shillings, with illustrated hard covers, high quality paper and print and lavishly illustrated by wood cuts and etchings. Artists included Frank Brangwyn, James Whistler, Augustus John, Walter Sickert, Arthur Rackham, Elinor Mansell and Charles Ricketts. The two volumes contained poetry by John Masefield, A.E.Houseman, Thomas Hardy, Edmund Gosse, T.Sturge Moore and James Joyce, prose by Edward Thomas, G.K.Chesterton, Richard Garnett and Arthur Ransome, and short plays by Violet Hunt, Somerset Maughan and Arthur Symons. There were no reviews or commentaries on current affairs; Venture was solely a cultural production, both stylish and upmarket, but like The Acorn and The Neolith which followed it, it was pretentious and exclusive.

This survey of late Victorian and Edwardian periodicals with a cultural component shows that while some nineteenth century publications had become extremely dull and many

¹ Times Literary Supplement, July 8, 1909, 249.

Edwardian ones were rather superficial, there was not the dearth of intelligent cultural journalism claimed both by Bennett in The New Age and Ford in The English Review. Three main points emerge which are relevant to a discussion of Ford's achievement as an editor. The first is that for more than a decade Ford was familiar with many impressive cultural journals which could serve him as possible models and on whose experience he could draw. He had, moreover, decided views on several of them; for example, he knew and admired The Yellow Book,¹ found The Athenaeum and The Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews heavy, and The Nineteenth Century and The Fortnightly Review lightweight.² He had, moreover, contributed to several of them, including The Savoy. He should have been under no illusions about the practical difficulties in running a cultural journal, nor about the likelihood of failure, since there were enough examples, particularly in the years immediately preceding the appearance of The English Review, to show him the organisational and financial hazards he might face.

The second point is the range of models from which Ford could choose. There were four time scales, quarterly, monthly, weekly and occasional and a whole host of possible modes of production, from the unillustrated to the lavishly illustrated. The decision to choose a monthly cycle of publication was probably a sensible one, given Ford's other writing commitments at the time, but the few, rather dreary illustrations in The English Review suggest that he had not considered the implications or indeed the impact of an illustrated periodical. He could also choose from a range of editorial policies. There were the general journals, which addressed a whole range of contemporary issues including culture; the subtitles of many of them indicate both the breadth and the similarities of their interests;

¹ Return to Yesterday, p.46.

² Ibid., p.177.

there were the purely cultural ventures such as The Savoy or Neolith and there were those devoted solely to writing such as The Bookman and The Times Literary Supplement. The most original journals were often the purely cultural ones, yet Ford, despite all his frequently expressed convictions about the primacy of culture, chose a hybrid kind of review, thus entering a market where there were already a range of monthlies and weeklies providing consistently intelligent commentary on Edwardian political and social as well as cultural life. There was no shortage of journals from which the Edwardian reading public could make a choice and a limit to how much cultural journalism this public could absorb.

The wide choice of journals is linked to a final point. Ford's claim to greatness as an editor rests heavily on the opportunities he gave to young and unpublished writers, yet many of the contributors to The English Review were already actively writing for at least one other Edwardian periodical, and fourteen of them had contributed to The Yellow Book, which had begun more than a decade earlier.¹ Thus English Review readers were not encountering a whole range of new voices and opinions, but were, in the form of the contributions of writers such as Hilaire Belloc and G.K. Chesterton, W.B. Yeats and Thomas Hardy, Henry Nevison and Edward Thomas, John Galsworthy and Arnold Bennett, Joseph Conrad and H.G. Wells, (and many others,) simply reading well known writers, engaging with well-aided ideas expressed in a familiar idiom. Indeed, it may even have been its familiarity, its sense of not breaking with a tradition of cultural journalism, which made The English Review so attractive to its first readers. What is absolutely clear is that it did not arise out of some kind of journalistic vacuum, nor did it fill a great hole in Edwardian cultural needs.

¹ The fourteen are Arnold Bennett, Ella D'Arcy, Anatole France, Henry James, Vernon Lee, Annie MacDonell, Dollie Radford, George Saintsbury, Arthur Symonds, Emile Verhaeren, Theodore Watts, H.G. Wells, W.B. Yeats and Max Beerbohm.

Chapter 4 The Career of The English Review

For a review which is so often referred to as an example of brilliant cultural journalism, there is a shortage of reliable information about how The English Review came to be founded and how it was managed; its finances, in particular, are shrouded in uncertainty. In the two years before The English Review was started, Ford was heavily involved in journalistic activities, first of all with a series of articles in The Daily Mail Literary Supplement in 1907, followed by another series in The Tribune later in the same year and a further series in The Daily News in the autumn of 1908. As he confided to R.A. Scott James, the editor of The Daily News, "I have the itch to discuss literary topics."¹ But it was only retrospectively that Ford admitted that he had wanted to have a periodical of his own from as early as 1907. He claimed that both the American publisher, S.S. McClure and Lord Northcliffe, the newspaper magnate, had asked him to run periodicals for them, but that he had turned them down because the kind of projects they had in mind were too political, too "muckraking" and insufficiently cultural.² It was, moreover, he thought, a good time to start a new project. "The old literary gang of the 'Athenaeum - Spectator - Heavy Artillery' order was slowly decaying. Younger lions were not only roaring but making carnage of their predecessors."³ Not all the lions listed by Ford were young; they included Henry James, George Moore, Thomas Hardy and George Meredith, as well as Ford's more immediate contemporaries such as W.B. Yeats, Joseph Conrad, H.G. Wells and Arnold Bennett. "It seemed to me that if that nucleus of writers could be got together, together with what of undiscovered talent the country might hold, a movement might be

¹ Ford to R.A. Scott James, Sept. 1907, Ludwig, p.25

² Ford, Return to Yesterday, p.362.

³ Ibid., p.363.

started ... mostly I desired to give the writers of whom I have spoken a rostrum as it were."¹ Ford may have convinced himself that he had returned from the United States in the autumn of 1906 with the intention of establishing such a rostrum, though he had in fact returned because the trip had been commercially unsatisfactory and he had run out of money. Two years later, with several more of his own books in print and his reputation as a writer more securely established, the time was more propitious.

In the same account of the review's founding, Ford also invented a politician who "was a virulent Tory of the new school, and he wanted an organ of his own."² The Tory politician was to put up half the capital, and to edit half the magazine, then withdrew from the venture because of the demands of his constituency and an impending general election. The Tory politician was a fiction; the references to help with the capital and editing should have been to H.G.Wells, who was involved in the very early plans for the review on those terms. The point is that Ford's recollections nearly 25 years after the event are not entirely accurate; indeed, he may have been deliberately misleading to protect the reputation of Wells, who had confided something of his complicated love-life to Ford..

It is likely that the initial impetus for the review did come from Ford, though different observers offer divergent accounts of exactly who else was involved. Violet Hunt, who was herself very closely involved with the affairs of the review, wrote of "its promoters, Hueffer, Marwood, Conrad and Wells, busily collecting artists to write and men of goodwill to read what they had written," though she also insisted that Wells was never at the review office, but was simply a Sussex contact.³ In the acrimonious correspondence

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid, p.364.

³ The Flurried Years, p.18.

between Ford and the Wells household in the early months of 1909, Ford claimed repeatedly that Wells had agreed to "share in the editing and bear half the cost,"¹ although Wells withdrew from both commitments early in the planning stage.

Ford himself in later years always spoke of The English Review as if it had been started by himself and Marwood. "In the lightness of our hearts and the inexperience of early middle age, Arthur Marwood and myself set out to afford a nucleus for some sort of movement that should combine some of the already Eminent with some of the Young."² Marwood's motive was apparently to publish Hardy's 'A Sunday Morning Tragedy' which had been turned down by The Cornhill Magazine. His indignation over this may have persuaded him to replace Wells as a financial backer, when the review threatened to founder during the planning year of 1908. Ford claimed the additional motive of trying "to find room for some of Conrad's less marketable efforts of the day,"³ Certainly, Conrad was in dire financial straits at the time, and admitted to Galsworthy that the money he was paid for Some Reminiscences "permitted me to pay for Borys' schooling and some other things."⁴ Douglas Goldring felt convinced that much of Ford's own editorial writing was "mainly devoted to erecting a pedestal on which to stand the possibly embarrassed figure of Henry James."⁵

However, despite Ford's insistence that it was himself and Marwood who had started the review, Conrad was also heavily involved in the planning stages, although later, after his

¹ Ford to Mrs. H.G.Wells, Jan.29, 1909, Ludwig, p31.

² Thus to Revisit, p.58.

³ Return to Yesterday, p.191

⁴ Conrad to Galsworthy, Apr.30,1909, Collected Letters, Vol.4, p.224.

⁵ Douglas Goldring, The Last Pre-Raphaelite (London:1948), p.142.

quarrel with Ford, he tried to claim that his part had been minimal. Douglas Goldring recalled that "Conrad was there fairly often in the first month of our existence,"¹ and Conrad himself, writing to Norman Douglas in September 1908, revealed a considerable familiarity with the organisation of the review, apologising for not getting Douglas' 'Isle of Typhoeus' in either of the first two issues because the review had already accepted articles by W.H.Hudson and Cunninghame Graham, and further referring to Ford as "the Editor and my intime."² In fact, Conrad's correspondence during the late summer and autumn of 1908 is full of references to the review - to Ford about the length of the instalments and about which of Anatole France's work to include in the review, to J.B.Pinker, reassuring him that his writing for The English Review would not interfere with his other writing, and to H.D.Davray, a regular contributor to Mercure de France, describing the new venture as "une Revue experimentale."³

Conrad's own memory was of a deep involvement. "Do you care to be reminded" he wrote to Ford in 1923 when The Transatlantic Review was being planned, "that the editing of the first number was finished in that farmhouse we occupied near Luton? You arrived one evening with your amiable myrmidons and parcels of copy."⁴ Conrad also, according to Ford, chose the name of the new undertaking though he could not have anticipated the legal difficulties that his choice would create for the new review. Ford thought the title was a strange choice, though he recorded that Conrad "felt a certain sardonic pleasure in choosing so national a name for a periodical that promised to be singularly international

¹ Douglas Goldring, Reputations (London:1920), p.219.

² Conrad to Douglas, Sept.29, 1908, Collected Letters, Vol.4, p.130.

³ Conrad to Davray, Oct. 9, 1908, *Ibid.*, p.141.

⁴ Conrad to Ford, Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters, Vol. II., ed. G.J.Aubry (London, 1977), p.323.

in tone."¹

Whoever was involved in the initial planning, it would seem that by the summer of 1908, the review was well under way. There was a plaque proclaiming The English Review above the bell of Ford's flat at 84, Holland Park Avenue, where the door was left open "to all and sundry - contributors, burglars and political refugees."² The young Douglas Goldring, who was then working for Country Life, was introduced to Ford by his editor, P. Anderson Graham, and was appointed as a part time sub-editor. "My translation to Ford Madox Hueffer's review was like a translation to Heaven."³ Stephen Reynolds, another aspiring young writer, was appointed later in the autumn "to look after the business part, advertising especially, and the initial stages of the literary part."⁴ Alan Judd claims that René Byles, one of the partners in the failed publishing company, Alston Rivers, was also involved as a helper, though there is no corroboration for this assertion.⁵ A Miss Olive Thomas, "beautiful and austere, kind and cold," was also appointed as secretary, and, according to Violet Hunt, imposed some kind of order on very considerable chaos.⁶ Violet herself became a "reader, occasional sub-editor, contributor, but above all ... a 'society hand' and touter for rich, influential subscribers."⁷

¹ Return to Yesterday, p. 365.

² Flurried Years, p.20.

³ Reputations, p.216.

⁴ Stephen Reynolds to Edward Garnett, Nov. 29, 1908, Letters of Stephen Reynolds, ed. Harold Wright (London:1923), p.113.

⁵ Alan Judd, Ford Madox Ford (London:1990), p.169. Alston Rivers had published three of Ford's books in 1906 and 1907.

⁶ Flurried Years, p.22.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p.28.

By 1908 and with the success of his three books on England and the English, and the Fifth Queen trilogy behind him, Ford had a very wide circle of literary friends and acquaintances, many of whom were persuaded into helping with or contributing to the review. In addition to Marwood, Conrad and Wells, these included Henry James, W.H.Hudson, W.B.Yeats, John Galsworthy, Hilaire Belloc and the three Garnett children; Robert acted as lawyer for the review, Edward advised Ford about acquiring contributions for early numbers, including material by Rossetti and Meredith, while Constance provided translations from Russian authors. Other contributors, such as Arnold Bennett, were solicited by Ford, although until the two men met in the spring of 1909, negotiations were conducted through Pinker, who was agent for both of them. Some contributors introduced others. It was Wells who encouraged Violet Hunt to contact Ford with some unpublished short stories: "Send them to the English Review. It's It this Year."¹ Conrad suggested Norman Douglas and Ella D'Arcy, while May Sinclair introduced Ezra Pound. Wyndham Lewis introduced himself by turning up and looking dark, mysterious and Russian, and producing manuscripts "from all over his person."² D.H.Lawrence's poems were sent into the review by Jessie Chambers. Not all these possible contributions were submitted before the review was launched, and certainly the examples are far from exhaustive. They do show, however, that Ford was well supplied with material for his review, and he himself claimed that he received an average of twenty scripts a day throughout his time as editor.³

Duckworth's were appointed as publishers for the review, and it was printed by Ballantyne & Co. of Covent Garden. After extensive advertising in other journals and a great deal of lobbying by Ford and his friends, the first number of The English Review, with its

¹ Flurried Years, p.19.

² Return To Yesterday, p.390.

³ *Ibid.*, p.383.

distinctive blue cover and stylish black type, and priced at half a crown, appeared at the end of November, 1908. With very few exceptions, it was very favourably received. The Evening Standard of November 25 stated that "it would hardly be possible to make a list more representative within the limits of one issue of a periodical of the best in current English literature." The Daily News, on November 27 said that it "surpassed expectation", while The Daily Mail on the following day announced that "The English Review or, at any rate, the first number of it, is very good." The Pall Mall Gazette of December 3 wrote: "If there is still a function for a high class literary magazine - now so sparsely represented amongst our periodicals - the English Review starts with every visible capacity for discharging it." Country Life on December 5 rated its appearance as "the most important event in the domain of periodical publication ... really a high class publication," while The Sunday Times on December 26 believed that "the first issue contains an overwhelming number of good things."¹

Private subscribers were also full of praise. D.H.Lawrence showed the December issue to Jessie Chambers during the Christmas holidays of 1908. "We were delighted with the journal. The very look of it with its fine blue cover and handsome black type, was satisfying. Father thoroughly appreciated it, and we decided to subscribe to it amongst us. The coming of The English Review into our lives was an event, one of the few really first-rate things which happen now and again in a life time."²

The initial success was very gratifying and meant that Ford was very much in demand, as Violet Hunt amusingly described. "After the English Review was well started in January,

¹ Harvey, pp.295-297.

² Jessie Chambers, D.H.Lawrence: A Personal Record (London: 1935), p.156.

the editor's courts were thronged socially ... And the Review was 'It' as Mr. Wells had foretold. The editor gave parties ... I lent my maid and my spoons, or he hired the ex-butler of Sir Frederick Leighton, who had ushered in Queen Victoria to see the President of the Royal Academy."¹

The euphoria was, however, short lived. The review was soon in considerable difficulties, caused largely by a lack of financial and organisational management, and by a series of quarrels between Ford and his contributors and backers.² Conrad had anticipated the financial difficulties, claiming that there was "enough capital to go for four issues" and that "if the public does not respond to the new monthly magazine devoted to Arts Letters and Ideas - then publication will end by the fourth issue."³ By March 1909, the review was in all kinds of trouble, and as Violet Hunt observed, "the Hand of the Lord lay heavy on the editor of the English Review."⁴

Some of the difficulties were relatively minor and may even have served temporarily to provide the review with free publicity. As early as November 7, 1908, The Academy gave notice that it was consulting its solicitors about the use of The English Review name, claiming that this was "used in a weekly magazine some years ago by a gentleman on the staff of the Academy."⁵ When Duckworth's refused to change the name in The English Review advertising, The Academy began a systematic campaign of vilification of Ford's journal. "The new English Review is an English Review which we should certainly not

¹ Flurried Years, pp. 48-9.

² Flurried Years, p.51

³ Conrad to Norman Douglas, Sept. 29, 1908, Collected Letters, Vol.4, p.131.

⁴ Flurried Years, p.51

⁵ The Academy, Nov. 7, 1908, 437.

wish to incorporate with the Academy. The first number is before us, and if we see the twelfth we will endeavour to get somebody to eat it ... it may be counted as a fat Socialist monthly."¹ On December 19, The Academy admitted it had no legal right to defend the title of The English Review, though it still protested at Duckworth's lack of courtesy in recognising its case. Throughout January, there were snide comments on The English Review contents, but by March, The Academy was again attacking it for Socialist tendencies and for associating with intellectuals who were engaged "in the flagrant obscuration of literary opinion."² By April, the attacks were venomous and personal. "The contents of the English Review ... would appear to have been lifted holus-bolus from the pellucid penny columns of the New Age - Arnold Bennett, Edward Garnett, Edward Thomas and Edgar Jepson, bleaters of 'isms' to a man." There was even a snide crack at Ford's German ancestry, describing him as "a gentleman of Mr. Hueffer's all-British name."³ The editor of The Academy, Lord Alfred Douglas, was so notoriously right wing that most journals were politically well to its left and found themselves the target for his witticisms; the most savage were directed at Orage's New Age and Ford's The English Review. Since both were riding high in public esteem at the time, there is a strong smell of sour grapes about Douglas' tirades.

The Spectator, too, under J.St.Loe Strachey, did not regard The English Review with any great favour. Although it accepted advertisements for the review in November and January, it criticized some of the contents of its early numbers. In March, however, The Spectator was involved in a rather more serious dispute with The English Review over Hilaire Belloc's article on press censorship. The Spectator took exception to those parts of the

¹ Ibid., Nov.21, 1908, 513-4.

² Ibid., Mar. 6, 1909, 844.

³ Ibid., Apr.3, 1909, 940.

Belloc piece which were "blacked out in a manner worthy of the Russian censor."¹ These, in fact, were comments which Belloc knew he could not get past the British censor; they were blacked out precisely to make the point about the limiting effect of the censorship rules. The Spectator offered a long defence of the libel laws, effectively accusing Belloc of slandering Lloyd George. The following week, The Spectator printed a letter from Belloc, which accused the journal of misrepresenting him, but adding a note: "Our comment was, in effect, that if Mr. Belloc had the courage of his opinions, there was no reason why he should not publish them in pamphlet form on his own responsibility. We note, and of course, accept Mr. Belloc's statement that he did not intend to refer to Lloyd George."² On April 3, The Spectator was forced to print a letter from The English Review's solicitors, pointing out that the blacked out portions of the text did not imply private scandal; The Spectator accepted this assurance.

These attacks on the integrity of The English Review may seem insignificant, and the attendant publicity probably did it more good than harm. But by the spring of 1909, the review was in all sorts of other trouble, and could well have managed without these distractions. As Violet Hunt reported, it was "costing its founder his life's blood in the way of money. Already there had been talk of making it into a company, and I think the German backers and relations were being invited to put more money into it."³ The German backers and relations seem not to have delivered the goods and Ford quarrelled with Marwood who was his major English source of finance. By June, he was receiving extensive loans from his Russian brother-in-law, David Soskice, who was actively involved in trying to raise share capital to put the review's finances on a sound footing.

¹ Ibid., Mar. 20, 1909, 451.

² Ibid., Mar. 27, 1909, 495.

³ Flurried Years, p.51

Correspondence from a Cambridge academic, Edward Browne, to Soskice, during the summer of 1909, shows not only that Browne himself purchased £300 of shares, but that he was trying to persuade other contemporaries to do the same. "It has become vital, I think, to encourage an independent review like the ER."¹

Ford's own account of the decline of the fortunes of his review in Return to Yesterday confirms that as "the work of the Review grew harder, money grew scarcer."² In April, he was hopeful that he could sell the review to a wealthy business man called Lyons, but by May this plan had to be abandoned in favour of the Soskice scheme for assembling a group of men with shared political interests to run the review, retaining Ford as editor. Ford claimed that the Soskice group took over the review leaving him simply as nominal editor; "My controllers established a committee of censorship over my editing."³ What is lacking in Ford's account is any clear sequence of events, though scrutiny of the review's editorials goes some way to substantiating his claim. The first four numbers, those over which Ford exercised full editorial control and which had been prepared before the financial crisis had really arisen, contained cultural editorials on 'The Function of the Arts in the Republic', with a separate section for 'Political and Diplomatic' commentary. This division was removed from the fifth issue in April onwards, when the first political editorial attacking German militarism appeared under the general heading, 'The Critical Attitude'. In May, almost the whole of this second section was devoted to political commentary. Thereafter, 'The Critical Attitude' struck an uneasy balance between political and cultural commentary, which suggests that a struggle for editorial control, between

¹ Edward Browne to David Soskice, July 9, 1909, House of Lords Record Office, Stow Hill Papers, DS 1, BRO.

² Return to Yesterday, p.391.

³ *Ibid.*, p.392.

Ford and the Soskice group, had taken place in the late spring and that by the summer, Ford had reasserted at least some of his editorial authority.

This authority was tenuous, however. When Ford, with Violet Hunt, returned from a visit to France in September, he found Galsworthy as temporary editor. Ford claimed that Galsworthy had introduced a number of writers to the review who gave it "a distinctly more Left aspect. Its sales diminished very considerably. There was a small public for imaginative literature, plus more or less imaginative handling of public matters, but they were frightened away by moderate, Left propaganda."¹ Subscribers may have been influenced by the political flavour of the review, but Ford was quite wrong to suggest that Galsworthy was responsible for major changes. He occupied the editorial chair for only two weeks and was simply trying to assemble enough copy for the November issue. He had been asked to do this by Soskice who was unable to contact Ford, and who suspected that Ford and Violet Hunt had absconded to France.

The political bias which Ford felt that Soskice and his associates had given to the review was used by him as a convenient excuse for some of the other disasters which befell it. For example, he implied that Marwood had withdrawn his financial backing and that Conrad had declined to finish Some Reminiscences because of the review's left wing and Russian connections.² Marwood was undoubtedly a Tory and Conrad hated everything Russian, but Ford was deliberately glossing over the personal differences which had arisen between them, and disregarding his own mismanagement of the affairs of the review.

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., pp.391-2.

Soskice's plan to find a group of business men to take over the review struggled on through the summer of 1909, apparently not always with Ford's blessing. Arthur Mizener cites an undated letter from Ford to Sir Alfred Mond, a rich business man and a long standing friend of Violet Hunt's, in which Ford tried to persuade him to buy the review to keep it from being politicised in Soskice's hands. "I have given such enormous labour to it that it would really break my heart to see it go to ruin, as it will if it passes into the hands of the Soskice group."¹ Some progress was made; by August, William Goode and David Soskice became the first directors of The English Review Company, £1000 was paid into The English Review account, and a new publishing contract was negotiated with Chapman and Hall to start on September 1, 1909.² But all this was too little too late, and on December 18, a liquidator was appointed for the review, which was sold to Sir Alfred Mond for a sum estimated by Ford to be a derisory £200.³ It seems that Violet persuaded Mond to buy the review, hoping that Ford would be kept on as editor. Ford himself seemed less sure about this. "I do not know how long I shall be able to go on with him or how long he will want me for."⁴ Mond didn't want him at all, and ejected Ford from the editorial chair "because he is a Liberal which no one could accuse me of being."⁵ Austin Harrison was appointed editor in Ford's place, though Ford stayed on long enough to assemble the first two issues for 1910.

He was, not surprisingly, extremely depressed; the contrast between the Ford who was so much in demand in January of 1909, and the Ford who, twelve months later, "for a week

¹ Arthur Mizener, The Saddest Story: A Biography of Ford Madox Ford (London: 1971), p.195.

² HLRO, Snow Hill Papers, DA3.

³ Mizener, p. 195.

⁴ Ford to Soskice, Jan.1, 1910, HLRO, Snow Hill Papers, BH 2/4.

⁵ Ford to R.A.Scott James, Jan, 1910, Ludwig, pp.39-40.

of mornings ... did not address more than three words" to Violet Hunt,¹ could hardly be more acute. Many years later Ford presented his loss of the review in very different terms. "The control of the English Review, which I had started mainly with the idea of giving a shove to Impressionism and its literary form, was really snatched from my hands by Mr. Pound and his explosive-mouthed gang of scarce breeched filibusters."² The truth was very different, much less dramatic and rather more squalid.

¹ The Flurried Years, p.91.

² Mightier than the Sword, p.281.

Chapter 5 The Failure of The English Review

There are three principal reasons why Ford lost control of the English Review. These can be summarized as an inability to organize, an excessive tendency to quarrel with important contributors and supporters, and monumental ineptness over money.

Ford could not control the paper work connected with the review. While he undoubtedly had a flair for selecting and assembling an impressive range of material,¹ it is in some ways surprising that the review ever reached the printers. Violet Hunt testified to the manuscripts "rammed in anyhow, bulging, sagging, sprouting out of the beautiful incrustured doors" of Ford's cabinet, and to the "priceless manuscripts" mingled with "empty packing cases and reams of discarded packing paper" in the backyard of Ford's landlord, Mr. Chandler.² Mizener refers to the fury of H.G.Wells and William Rossetti when manuscripts which they had given to Ford went astray³ and Conrad confirmed Ford's carelessness with manuscripts, complaining to Pinker that Ford had mislaid a typed copy of Rescue: "What they have done with it God only knows."⁴ Douglas Goldring reported how Ford regularly instructed him to take a box in the stalls of the Shepherd's Bush Empire, so that he and Ford could retreat from the pressures of contributors and Ford's increasingly complicated private life, to select articles and correct proofs.⁵ He was, according to Goldring, as a manager "more childishly incapable than any man I have ever met"⁶, and he "drove both

¹In Mightier Than The Sword, p.103, Ford describes reading only the first paragraph of D.H.Lawrence's 'The Odour of Chrysanthemums' and knowing that it was good enough for publication.

² Flurried Years, p.22.

³ Mizener, p.166.

⁴ Conrad to Pinker, Jan. 21, 1909, Collected Letters, Vol.4, p.190.

⁵ South Lodge, p.32.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p.22.

printers and compositors wild" with his unorthodox practices and illegible handwriting.¹

The unsung heroine of the review was almost certainly its secretary, "the extremely decorative and highly efficient Miss Thomas"², who was able to compensate to some extent for the chaos produced by its editor.

Ford's cantakerousness can be explained, in part, by a private life which was increasingly complicated by his affair with Violet Hunt, though his whole life was marked by periods of extreme depression. The row with H.G. Wells was at its fiercest in the early months of 1909. Ford seemed to have coped with Wells' withdrawal from financial and editorial help with the review. What aroused his fury was Wells' suggestion that the serialisation of Tono-Bungay was having a deleterious effect on the profits of the novel, which appeared in book form at the beginning of February, when the serial version had another month to run. Ford's version of events is given in a letter to Mrs. Wells; typically, Ford chose an oblique approach to the problem, for which he later apologised to Wells.

Last January, [1908] Wells asked me to start the Review saying that Tono-Bungay was not marketable and the Review would advertise him and do him good. His proposal was that he should share in the editing and bear half the cost. A little later in conversation he said - I use his own words - that he wanted to back out of the editing and that he felt like a worm for deserting me. I agreed to his backing out of the editing. A week later he said that he desired to back out of contributing to the cost of the Review and that once more he felt like a worm. I agreed to his backing out of the cost of the Review.³

Thus far Ford's behaviour appears positively saintly. However, he went on to explain that the original agreement was for Wells to have one fifth of the profits as payment for his novel, and that when Wells withdrew from financial and editorial support, Ford did not

¹ Flurried Years, p.45.

² South Lodge, p.22.

³ Ford to Mrs. Wells, Jan. 29, 1909, Ludwig, p.31.

withdraw the offer of profits. What Ford failed to point out was that there would be no profits, a fact which had not escaped Wells' attention.

In a second letter to Jane Wells, Ford protested indignantly; "I am risking large sums of money and am doing my best to prevent Wells having any kind of risks whilst assuring him of the full share of the money that I have expended."¹ There was a threat of some kind of proceedings against Wells, though Ford tried to assure him that "it is not I, but my partners who are taking action in this matter."² Precisely what these proceedings might have been is difficult to discern from the correspondence. What does emerge is that by February 1909, Ford was forced to admit that "the actual profits of the first four numbers will be non-existent," and that he was willing to offer Wells a share of the good will, "which may be considerable, if we can keep the Review running a little longer." He did not, however, want to make this a formal agreement since it would render Wells liable for English Review debts. Throughout the quarrel, Ford presented himself as the aggrieved party; the review, he claimed, "has been the means of conferring on you all the credit of the enterprise, while all I have got have been the trouble and the expense."³ Ford was certainly let down by Wells over help with the editing and financing of the review, but he had also promised Wells more than he could deliver in terms of financial reward. Wells may have pulled out from any major commitment to the review because of the increasing complications of an affair with Amber Reeves, the daughter of two prominent members of the Fabian society - she gave birth to a daughter by Wells in December, 1909 - and he may well have quarrelled with Ford, simply in irritation at the complexity of his private

¹ Ford to Mrs. Wells, Feb.1, 1909, Ibid., p.34.

² Ford to Wells, Feb. 1909, Ibid., p.35.

³ Ibid.

life.¹ Even after Ford had relinquished the review, the quarrel rumbled on, as Wells tried to salvage something from the financial settlement. He claimed he was owed £250, but Ford denied all knowledge of this. "I know nothing more about the business. I owe nobody anything at all ... The books of the Review as long as it was under my direction are open to you if you happen to doubt any of these statements."² The books, alas, have long since disappeared.

The quarrel with Arnold Bennett was also about money, though it was neither as savage nor as lasting as the row with Wells. The two men had not met when the review first appeared, although Ford had written to Bennett to commission a long short story, negotiations to be conducted through the literary agent, Pinker. Ford's idea of a good price differed from that of Bennett, who wrote indignantly to Pinker; "I presume that Hueffer will not argue that two guineas a thousand is a price so high that it must be specially referred to as an inducement. I am quite willing to accept my ordinary price, three guineas, and I do not think Hueffer will make a difficulty as to this."³ He was mistaken; Ford paid Pinker the lower price, and Bennett's response was that "though we have been 'done', we are not favourably impressed."⁴ He indicated his disapproval to Ford by refusing to accept an invitation to dine with him.

Yet in this case, reconciliation was easy. Bennett's account in Outlook summarizes the affair neatly.

¹ This is speculation. Anthony West's H.G. Wells: Aspects of a Life (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985) simply draws attention to Wells' difficulties with the Fabians during Ford's English Review years.

² Ford to Wells, April 2, 1910, *Ibid.*, p.43.

³ Bennett to Pinker, Jan. 8, 1909, The Letters of Arnold Bennett, Vol. I, Letters to J.B. Pinker (London: 1966), p.119.

⁴ Bennett to Pinker, Jan. 13, 1909, *Ibid.*, p.120.

I replied in sorrow that I could not come to dinner as I considered he had done me in the eye over the price of a short story. He wrote to ask me by how much I considered he had done me in the eye. I replied by at least ten pounds. He sent me a cheque for ten pounds. I attended his dinner. We have been excellent friends ever since.¹

Not only did they become 'excellent friends', but Bennett made a gift of subsequent contributions to the review. As he explained to Pinker, "I am thinking of letting Hueffer print What the Public Wants ... I told him I would give it him, but he said if it increased the sale he would pay me a royalty!!! I like him! I think he can't help being devious."² Ford's explanation was that he was "running a philanthropic institution for the benefit of better letters" and that he stood "to be shot at ... But not through Pinker! ... When a commercial gent comes to me, I simply feel it sporting to beat him at his own game."³ Bennett was undoubtedly right about Ford's deviousness, and this very deviousness and inconsistency over financial matters contributed to the difficulties of the review. But the incident also reveals something of Ford's charisma as an editor, as well as the esteem in which the review was held by established authors.

The row with Conrad was in some ways surprising since they had worked together very closely on Conrad's contribution to the review. Ford even took down the early pages from Conrad's dictation. "These are things which I could not dictate to anyone but a friend - and such a friend is Hueffer who consents to hold the pen for me - a proof of friendship and an act of great kindness."⁴ They ostensibly fell out over a note which Ford included in the July issue of the review, regretting "that owing to a serious illness of Mr. Joseph Conrad we are compelled to postpone the publication of the next instalment of his

¹ Outlook, Oct. 11, 1913, 251.

² Bennett to Pinker, May 11, 1909, Letters Vol.I, p.121.

³ Ford to Bennett, cited, unattributed, in a footnote, *Ibid*.

⁴ Conrad to Pinker, Sept 18, 1908, Collected Letters, Vol. 4, p.125.

Reminiscences."¹ Certainly Conrad's health was not good during this period, and he was in any case a notorious hypochondriac, but he was infuriated by what he saw as Ford's interference. "I had a most damnable go of gout which absolutely prevented me from getting the 8th inst of Rems ready in time ... I was vexed by that silly editorial note and if he had to do it, *indisposition* was a quite strong enough word for all practical purposes."² Ford seems to have exacerbated the situation by suggesting that Conrad had brought the review into disrepute by not delivering the expected instalment, and at the end of July, Conrad wrote to him sternly, addressing him as 'Dear Hueffer' instead of the more usual 'Dear Ford' or even 'Dearest Ford' of earlier letters, and declining to write any more for the review. The reasons he gives are literary. "It is another installment which would make the thing ragged ... On a dispassionate view I see it so clearly that nothing on earth would induce me to spoil the thing as it now stands by an irrelevant installment."³ But Ford's note in the review was, for Conrad, simply the last straw; the relationship between the two men had been deteriorating for some time.

Conrad's correspondence in the early months of 1909 shows that he was aware of the review's financial difficulties. He welcomed the efforts of Ford and Marwood to try to sell the review to Lyons, the "eating house keeper", because "if it comes off it will be good for us poor devils for there will be really some money behind."⁴ What Conrad, as a Pole, could not stomach, however, was the idea of Russian money and influence supporting the review, and he was consistently hostile to David Soskice's attempts to help Ford, referring

¹ English Review, Vol.II, July 1909, 824.

² Conrad to Edward Garnett, July 19, 1909, Collected Letters, Vol.4, p.258.

³ Conrad to Ford, July 31, 1909, *Ibid.*, p.264.

⁴ Conrad to Norman Douglas, May, 1909, *Ibid.*, p.228.

to Soskice as "that horrible Jew."¹

What alienated Conrad most, however, was that he became embroiled in the turmoil surrounding the breakdown of Ford's marriage. In an attempt to save her marriage, Ford's wife, Elsie, visited Conrad towards the end of April 1909, and accused Marwood of making advances to her. Conrad was appalled, siding with Marwood, whom he described as "a gallant-homme in the fullest sense - absolutely incapable of any black treachery." It was, he wrote, "a beastly affair to be mixed up with even in the role of mere spectator-auditors. I have been and am still thoroughly upset."² Since Ford was already feeling that Marwood got all the credit for the review, while he simply was blamed for its failures,³ and since Marwood was involved in the negotiations with Soskice and Robert Garnett over the finances and control of the review,⁴ Elsie's accusation dropped into an already explosive situation. This was made still worse when Ford and Violet Hunt became lovers in early June. Mizener claims that there were indiscreet letters from Marwood to Elsie, citing a letter from Robert Garnett who had seen this correspondence.⁵ What is clear is that friends, both of Ford and of Marwood, became involved in the whole sordid business and Conrad was intensely irritated by it. Ford himself did not help matters by using Elsie to try to introduce Willa Cather, who was in England looking for material for McClure's Magazine, to Conrad, knowing that Conrad was not an admirer of the American publisher McClure. Writing to Ford (and addressing him as Hueffer), Conrad's irritation is clear. "I get your

¹ Conrad to Galsworthy, July 17, 1909, *Ibid.*, p.255.

² Conrad to Galsworthy, Apr. 30, 1909, *Ibid.*, p.224.

³ Mizener, p.180.

⁴ Ford to Elsie, no date, quoted in Mizener, p.182. (Max Saunders, in his forthcoming critical biography of Ford, argues that the date of the letter is May 9, 1909.)

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

letter like a bolt from the blue throwing at my head a lot of things of which I had no previous inkling ... as a basis for reproaches! ... Stop this nonsense with me ... It's ugly. I won't have it."¹ By early July he was writing about Ford's "furies, his agonies ... and his general carryings on like a spoilt kid."² In August the disillusionment with Ford was complete. "His conduct is *impossible* ... He's a megalomaniac who imagines he is managing the universe and that everyone treats him with the blackest ingratitude ... In short he has quarrelled with every decent friend he had; has nearly made mischief between me and some of my best friends."³ The result of all this was that Ford became alienated both from his principal backer and from one of his major contributors, neither of whom the review could afford to lose.⁴

Once the news of Ford's affair with Violet Hunt leaked out, Henry James, too, turned against them, and declined to allow Violet to visit him for the weekend. Although Violet reassured herself "that the one thing Henry dreaded was being mixed up with life in any way, or entangled in anything that went on outside the drawing-room door,"⁵ such a rejection, following that of Conrad and Marwood, was extremely painful, both to herself and Ford, though Ford, unlike Violet, never complained of the behaviour of his three erstwhile friends.

During Ford's editorship, he also quarrelled with a number of other individuals connected

¹ Conrad to Ford, May 20, 1909, Collected Letters, Vol. 4, p.236.

² Conrad to Perceval Gibbon, July 4, 1909, *Ibid.*, p. 253.

³ Conrad to Pinker, Aug. 4, 1909, *Ibid.*, pp.265-6.

⁴ Elsie's relationship with Marwood, and its effect on both Ford and Conrad is discussed fully in Chapter 17, '1909: The Wrecks of Friendships', in the forthcoming critical biography of Ford, by Max Saunders.

⁵ Flurried Years, p.88.

with the review, including all the Garnetts, Wyndham Lewis and Stephen Reynolds, who by his own account was unfit for the assistant editor's job on the review, and who resigned from it in January, 1909.¹ Wyndham Lewis believed that Ford had promised him regular work for the review; "I hope Hueffer will keep to his promise of taking me on as a regular hand."² Not only did Ford not keep his promise, but he delayed payment on the three contributions which Lewis did make to the review, causing Lewis to refer to him as "a shit of the most dreary and uninteresting type."³ The quarrel with Reynolds was also about payment for his novel The Holy Mountain, which was serialised in the review. According to Mizener, Ford also offended Frank Harris by passing on Marwood's uncomplimentary opinion of his short story, 'The Miracle of the Stigmata'.⁴ The story did eventually appear in the review in April, 1910, though whether it was accepted by Ford or Austin Harrison isn't known. Ford certainly showed a propensity to fall out with people during his English Review period, much more so, in fact, than when he was editing The Transatlantic Review. Since both reviews suffered from chronic disorganisation and financial difficulties, it would seem that his cantankerousness during the earlier period was more the result of personal difficulties and unhappiness, than caused by the editorial task itself. It has to be said, however, that his bad temper did not help his review. What all the bickerings during 1909 indicate is that Ford's control of himself, his friends and colleagues, as well as the review itself was increasingly tenuous.

The whole thing was exacerbated by financial difficulties. Ford's original plan for financing

¹ Reynolds to Ford, Jan.10, 1909, Letters of Stephen Reynolds, p.115.

² Wyndham Lewis to Sturge Moore, no date, Letters of Wyndham Lewis, ed. W.K.Rose (London: 1963), pp.39-40.

³ Lewis to Sturge Moore, Sept. 1909, cited in Jeffrey Meyers, The Enemy (London: 1980), p.28.

⁴ Mizener, p.164.

the review seems to have been some kind of profit sharing scheme; as he explained to Edward Garnett, who warned him about the possible awkwardness of this, "I am an idealist and my ideal is to run the English Review as far as possible as a socialist undertaking."¹ Some of Ford's accounts of this profit sharing scheme are so complicated and bizarre as to be virtually incomprehensible; even Conrad, who had been involved in the review throughout the entire planning stage, and who was himself intended to be a participant in the scheme, admitted that the details were not clear to him.² Perhaps the simplest version is that contained in a memorandum to H.G.Wells, which, though undated, seems to precede their quarrel.

The publisher was to bear all expenses of printing, publishing and everything except advertising and was to receive in exchange one-fifth of the gross receipts. A capitalist was to be found by Mr. Hueffer to find money for advertisement and such contributors as took their payment in money. To him a share of one-fifth in the proceeds was also payable. The share of Mr. Hueffer was to be one-fifth. The remaining two fifths of the gross receipts was to be divided amongst the as yet unpaid contributors in the proportion of the space filled by them.³

This sounds fine as long as the gross receipts yielded sufficient excess of income over expenditure to allow for this. The original capital for the review came from Marwood and from Ford himself. "Of the £5000 that we spent on the review, he [Marwood] paid £2200 and I paid £2800, I being generally liable for the debts of the undertaking beyond that sum."⁴ The Financial Times for March 8, 1909, lists Ford as the general partner and Marwood as the limited partner, each of them putting up £500, Ford's contribution including £150 he had borrowed from Elsie,⁵ but the much larger sums claimed by Ford

¹ Ford to Edward Garnett, Oct. 17, 1908, Ludwig, pp.27-8.

² Conrad to Pinker, Dec. 17, 1908, Collected Letters Vol.4, p.167.

³ Cited in Mizener, pp.160-1.

⁴ Ford to Wells, Apr.2, 1910, Ludwig, p.42.

⁵ Mizener, p.161.

seem possible in the light of what is known about the expenditure of the review. It is, however, impossible to discover whether all this capital was available at once, or indeed, exactly where the large amount apparently spent by Ford actually came from. Conrad believed there was "enough capital to go on for four issues"¹, which seems very little, and Bennett showed his usual shrewd business sense when he wrote to Ford; "The chief thing I wish you in connection with the English Review is plenty of capital."²

It is difficult to establish accurate figures either for the income or the expenditure of the review, since financial records for both publisher and printer were destroyed during the blitz; only two cash books survive amongst the Sossice family papers. The review sold for two shillings and sixpence a copy, and Ford estimated that the first two issues sold roughly 2000 copies.³ This figure may well be an overestimate by Ford, and even if it is accurate, sales may not have continued at this level. Jessie Chambers noticed that when she and D.H.Lawrence visited Ford in November 1909, "in the flat there were piles of the English Review lying on the black polished floor and on the window seat,"⁴ which suggests that there were large numbers of unsold copies. This idea is supported by the fact that when the review went into liquidation in December, 1909, no offers could be found for 15000 unsold copies of the review, Duckworth's claiming a lien on these.⁵ Income from sales seems to have been limited.

There were two other sources of income. One was from backers, including the money of

¹ Conrad to Douglas, Sep.29, 1908, Collected Letters Vol.4, p.131.

² Bennett to Ford, Oct.9, 1908, Letters Vol.II, p.227.

³ Ford to Wells, Mar.1909, cited in Mizener, p.160.

⁴ D.H.Lawrence: A Personal Record, p.169.

⁵ HLRO, Stow Hill Papers, BH 2/4.

"cohorts of relations - German Hueffers, Dutch Hueffers, Paris Hueffers,"¹ and later, of course, from Ford's brother-in-law, David Soskice, whose bank pass book for 1909 shows numerous loans, both to Ford and The English Review; most of those to the review, beginning in May were for £100, though there was one loan for nearly £800 on July 20.² There was also money from the sale of shares when Soskice tried to form a company to bale out the review; Edward Browne, for example, wrote a cheque for £300 on August 10, 1909;³ how many other such investors there were is unknown. Neither is it clear whether any of this money is included in the £2800 which Ford claimed to have spent on the review. The other source of income was the revenue from advertisements placed in the review. This was originally the responsibility of Stephen Reynolds, who after working for the review for one week a month from November 1908 to January 1909, couldn't wait to give it up.⁴ The number of advertisements increased during 1909, but even when a new advertising manager, M.S. Rothwell, was appointed in September 1909, when Chapman and Hall became publishers for the review, advertising revenue was only about £30 a month.⁵

Compared with the expenditure for the review, this kind of income was insignificant. The costs for printing, paper and distribution averaged, according to Ford, about £200 a month, which in itself wiped out the income from sales.⁶ The review was also advertised extensively in other publications including The Athenaeum, Harpers, The Nation, The New Age, The New Quarterly, Outlook, The Saturday Review, The Spectator, The Times

¹ Flurried Years, p.27.

² HLRO, Stow Hill Papers, DS 4/8.

³ Ibid., DS 1, Box 4.

⁴ Reynolds to Pinker, Jan.10,1909, Letters of Stephen Reynolds, p.114.

⁵ HLRO, Stow Hill Papers, BH 2/4

⁶ Ford to Wells, Mar.1909, cited in Mizener, p.160.

Literary Supplement, The Westminster Gazette, The Glasgow Herald and The Daily Telegraph. Such advertising costs were not cheap. For example, between November 14, 1908 and September 4, 1909, The Nation carried five full page, seven half page and three quarter page advertisements for the review; a full page cost £10. The cash book for October 1909 reveals a total expenditure on advertising of £72.5/-, more than double the previous month's income from advertising revenue.

There were also salaries to be paid. There are no figures available for the earlier months of the review, but the earlier of the two extant cashbooks, which runs from May 18 to July 6, 1909, and which was untidily kept in assorted handwriting, shows only a salary of £1 to a M.Martindale; this is presumably Elsie's sister who may have offered clerical assistance. The second cash book, which runs from July 7 to October 11, and covers much of the period when Soskice was running the financial side of the review, shows Soskice receiving £6 a week as business manager, Rothwell £5 as advertising manager and Douglas Goldring £2.10/-. Ford himself appears to have been paid £6 a week¹, although he later claimed that he had received no payment.²

By far the biggest drain on resources, however, was payment to contributors. According to Violet Hunt, Ford's policy was always to pay his contributors exactly what they asked. "This was the editor's system. Sometimes they didn't ask at all, or suggested modestly the derisive sum of a couple of guineas for a forty pound article like Mr. Cunninghame Graham."³ Ford himself confirmed this, although writing more than twenty years after he had given up the review. "I used to ask my contributors to demand any rate of pay they

¹ Ibid.

² Ford to Wells, Apr.2, 1910, Ludwig, p.42.

³ Flurried Years, p.29.

liked, leaving it to their consciences to ask a fair average price for their work ... One or two certainly asked for and got a great deal more than they had ever imagined getting. On the other hand, many of the wealthier - and not a few of the indigent - writers wrote for me for nothing."¹ Ford is a little disingenuous here, since it has already been shown that he was prepared to try to get away with paying as little as possible to Arnold Bennett. He also felt that there was some kind of limit to what he was prepared to spend; he did not publish anything by G.B.Shaw, whom he admired, because he couldn't afford him. As he wrote jokingly to Shaw, "I should have to increase my circulation on your account by 8,000 copies, to make it just barely pay your fee alone."² The important thing, however, is that he did pay contributors; Edgar Jepson strongly refuted accusations that contributors were not paid. "I cannot think who they can have been, for it certainly paid me and all the contributors I knew."³ What Ford seems to have asked contributors in the very early days was; "Will you take £2 a 1000 words, or will you take a sporting risk which might be estimated at two to one against you as a shareholder?"⁴ Whichever strategy Ford adopted it was clearly a system open to abuse, and the arbitrary pricing of contributions for the review did not lend itself to accurate financial management.

The amount of payment to some contributors is known. For example, Hardy received £20 for his poem 'Sunday Morning Tragedy',⁵ Henry James was paid forty guineas, £30 and thirty six guineas for 'The Jolly Corner', 'The Velvet Glove' and 'Mora Montravers'

¹ Return to Yesterday, p.383.

² Ford to Shaw, Ford Reader, Nov. 25, 1908, p.472.

³ Memories of an Edwardian, p.149.

⁴ Ford to Edward Garnett, Oct.17, 1908, Ludwig, p.28.

⁵ South Lodge, p.18.

respectively,¹ and Wyndham Lewis was paid five guineas for each of his contributions.² Conrad was paid £80 for the first four installments of Some Reminiscences³, although the review cash book records a payment of £25 to Conrad in late June of 1909.⁴ If, as seems likely, this is payment for an installment of the memoirs, then Conrad received more than £160 for the seven installments, almost the whole of one month's income from sales. The same entry records payment of £15 to Ella d'Arcy, probably for her long short story, 'Agatha Blount', £3 each to Ezra Pound and Eden Philpotts for poems and £2 to Edward Thomas for a book review. The matching of payments to contributions which appeared in the June issue is purely speculative, since the cash book simply records recipients.

An advertisement in The New Age shows that the review was never really regarded as a commercial proposition. "In supporting the English Review ... the reader will be not so much supporting a commercial undertaking as performing a duty, since he will be aiding in presenting to the world some of its most valuable thought."⁵ In later life, Ford conceded that he had known "that the Review could not be made to run on any sort of commercial lines."⁶ It would perhaps have been more accurate to say that he could not have run it on commercial lines. Cultural journals are not produced to make their editors rich, but Ford, by his wilful inconsistency over payments and his lack of sound accounting practice,

¹ Michael Anesko, "Friction with the Market": Henry James and the Profession of Authorship (New York: 1986), p.196.

² The Enemy, p.28.

³ Conrad to Ford, Dec. 17, 1908, Collected Letters Vol.4, p.166.

⁴ HLRO, Stow Hill Papers, BH 2/4.

⁵ New Age, Mar. 25, 1909, 445.

⁶ Return to Yesterday, p.382.

brought the review perilously close to extinction. Without full accounts, it is impossible to estimate the full extent of the losses made by the review, though they were, according to Douglas Goldring, such as "must have staggered even a Northcliffe."¹ Ford himself reckoned that the first four issues alone lost £1200, while Mizener estimates the actual loss per issue to have been at least £500, though this sum is reached by working on Ford's own unreliable estimates and then adding a percentage to take account of this unreliability.² Unless an audited set of accounts miraculously turns up in some archive, the truth about the review's finances will never be known. The only thing that can be stated is that the finances were in a mess, and that for this Ford was largely responsible.

¹ South Lodge, p.30.

² Mizener, p.160. Max Saunders challenges Mizener's figures, estimating a loss of £265 per issue. There are two points here - that any figures are no more than estimates and that the review lost a great deal of money.

Chapter 6 The English Review Editorial Policy

The first full statement of Ford's editorial policy for The English Review appeared in the circular which he wrote to raise interest in the review before it was published; it is worth quoting in full.

The only qualification for admission to the pages of the Review will be - in the opinion of the Editors - either distinction of individuality or force of conviction, either literary gifts or earnestness of purpose, whatever the purpose may be - the criterion of inclusion being the clarity of diction, the force of illuminative value of the views expressed. What will be avoided will be the superficiality of the specially modern kind which is the inevitable consequence when nothing but brevity of statement is aimed at. The English Review will treat its readers not as spoiled children who must be amused by a variety of games, but with respectful consideration due to grown minds whose leisure can be interested by something else than the crispness and glitter of a popular statement.¹

There is a certain blandness about this declaration as well as a fair amount of question begging, about, for example, what might be meant by 'distinction of individuality' or 'the force of illuminative value of the views expressed', but there is nothing surprising or inconsistent with Ford's general literary and critical principles. It is clear that he was aiming at an educated, intelligent readership, that he wanted the review to communicate clearly and that he wanted to avoid the superficial and popular. In a later advertisement Ford argued that a subscriber to the review would "aid in removing from the country the stigma of having it said that such an undertaking is too good to find intelligent support."²

The publicity for the review was not entirely consistent about what kind of journal it was to be. Some of it suggests that it was intended to be political as well as cultural. "The most able and distinguished writers of today will contribute to the Review: its Editorial

¹ Flurried Years, pp.26-7.

² Athenaeum, Apr.3, 1909, 397.

comments upon Topics of the Month will be without party bias, and will be supplemented by communications from well known Statesmen and Diplomats."¹ The list of contents for each issue always included the names of political contributors, and there were special slips with red print attached to the front cover of the May and June issues, to draw attention to President Taft's article on the Panama Canal and Camille Pelletan's 'La Paix et la Guerre en Europe'. This emphasis on the political content seems to place The English Review in the same hybrid category as most of its contemporaries; the purely cultural journal was a rarity. Eric Homberger has claimed that Ford's "formula for the Review reversed the form of the typical quarterlies of the Edwardian era, whose main function was the discussion of political, social and intellectual tendencies."² Chapter Three has shown that the 'typical' Edwardian did address cultural issues, and that Ford was following an established pattern in creating a hybrid review. The difference between The English Review and its contemporaries is more one of the balance of contributions than of kind.

Yet Ford wanted to claim that the uniqueness of his review consisted in its preoccupation with literature, and he published a lengthy statement to this effect in the English Review Advertiser in March 1909.

The English Review differs from all its contemporaries in the fact that it is mainly concerned with literature. It thus competes in no way with any review now existing; on the contrary it supplements them all ... Its contemporaries deal mostly with facts political and contemporary. The English Review deals entirely with thought which is neither of today alone nor solely of tomorrow.³

While it is true that the review is remembered largely for its literary achievements, Ford's claim does not stand close scrutiny. The English Review devoted about a third of its space

¹ Advertisement in New Age, Nov.5, 1908, 33.

² Eric Homberger, 'Ford's English Review: Englishness and its Discontentments', Agenda, 27:4 - 27:1 (Winter 1989-Spring 1990), 63

³ English Review Advertiser, Mar. 1909, xii.

to contemporary political and social issues, and to national and international affairs. Topics such as German military aggrandisement, the Turkish question, female suffrage and Lloyd George's 1909 budget were discussed extensively in The English Review and not simply in Outlook, The New Age and The Spectator. And a very wide range of Edwardian periodicals, as the chapter on Edwardian journalism has shown, published original prose and poetry as well as reviews of contemporary cultural events and books, and expressed views on the cultural state of the nation.

Many years later Ford was still producing different accounts of the nature of the review's contents. In a foreword to The English Review Book of Short Stories, he wrote: "The English Review as by us established differed from the existing reviews in that our chief interest was with imaginative literature."¹ He gave the impression that the political articles were simply there to fill out the space. "Into any remaining cracks in the structure we dropped the weary imbecilities that pass for seriousness. We gave, that is to say, very infinitesimal space to the Dardenelles problem, Chinese egg problems, Alaskan boundaries, Turkish debts and all the lugubrious pomposities."² Yet in the same year, he claimed that he had known that a purely literary magazine would not sell and that he had deliberately set out to produce a "hybrid, giving at least half its space to current affairs."³ Perhaps Ford's deprecation of the political contents of the review arose both from his reverence for imaginative writing and from a desire to be seen as a man of letters rather than a political hack. Whatever he may have claimed for it, the fact remains that The English Review was never a journal solely concerned with literature and other forms of culture.

¹ Ford, 'Foreword', in The English Review Book of Short Stories, compiled by Horace Shipp (London: 1932), p.vii.

² *Ibid.*, p.viii.

³ Return to Yesterday, p.363.

The balance between literature and politics can be seen by examining the contents of the review. The first issues were 200 pages in length, though this was down to about 180 pages by the ninth issue in August 1909. Of this total number of pages, two thirds to three quarters were devoted solely to imaginative literature, which always appeared first. The remainder of the review was called 'The Month', and its format altered as the fortunes of the review fluctuated.

From December 1908 to March 1909, the first item in 'The Month' was called *Editorial*, and consisted of a series of articles on contemporary cultural conditions, three to five pages in length, written by Ford and called 'The Function of the Arts in the Republic'. This was followed by a much longer section called *Political and Diplomatic*, which, as its heading suggests, consisted of several articles on social and political themes. In the first issue of the review, for example, this section was concerned with unemployment and the widespread lack of understanding of the lives of the poor. "And the poor are breaking in on us everywhere ... But of knowledge of the lives and aspirations of the poor man how little we have."¹ This was followed by articles from W.H.Hudson on 'How it Feels to be Unemployed', R.B.Cunninghame Grahame on ways of alleviating the unemployment problem, and Arthur Marwood's 'Complete Actuarial Scheme for Insuring John Doe against all the Vicissitudes of Life', which was designed "to enable the labouring man to provide against destitution in old age."² This concern for the poor and underprivileged was, in fact, a continuing concern of the review. In March 1909, G.K.Chesterton wrote on 'The Homelessness of Jones'; this was a fairly bleak discussion of the unfairness of existing social systems. The June editorial attacked Lloyd George's budget for its timidity and for

¹ *English Review*, Vol.I, Dec. 1908, 161.

² *Ibid.*, 171.

imposing taxes unfairly, and there was further discussion of the budget in July when the economist, J.A.Hobson, highlighted the resentment of those faced with large tax increases, and who objected to their taxes being used, not to wage war, but for "the multifarious enlargement of State functions for the particular advantage of the poorer classes."¹ In November, E.S.P.Haynes, writing on the Divorce Law Reforms which were currently being considered by the House of Commons, also commented on the injustices wished onto the poor by the wealthy. "There are still many worthy citizens who are quite startled by the proposition that the poor should enjoy the same relief as the rich for their matrimonial troubles."² The English Review, unlike Orage's The New Age, was not a Socialist journal; indeed, it disclaimed all party bias. Its general social and political philosophy, however, was remarkably egalitarian.

From April 1909 onwards, while the overall heading 'The Month' was retained, the *Editorial and Political and Diplomatic* sections disappeared and were replaced by *The Critical Attitude*, a kind of editorial commentary. From April to August, these reflected the political interests of Soskice and his group of potential review backers, and discussed such current political issues as German aggrandisement in April, Lloyd George's budget in June and the suffragette movement in August. Thereafter, until he ceased to edit the review altogether, Ford used *The Critical Attitude* to articulate his own feelings about the need for culture in what he perceived to be a fundamentally uncultured nation. The balance of the remainder of the contents of 'The Month' varied from one issue to the next. In May, for example, with the exception of a small drama section reviewing five plays, everything in 'The Month' was political, but in other issues, there was roughly the same amount of

¹ Ibid., Vol.II, July, 1909, 794.

² Ibid., Vol.III, Nov.1909, 725.

political and cultural discussion. Almost all issues contained book reviews, usually of original imaginative writing, but including, for example, in July, a review of Masterman's The Condition of England. In November, a new section was added for *Publications Received*, a listing of recently published work, such as was to be found in several other contemporary journals.

Despite Ford's apparent scorn for the political and social contents of the review, he wrote extensively about the crises of contemporary social and domestic life. He also wrote a number of powerfully worded political articles. *The Critical Attitude* for August 1909, for example, was a passionate defence of the suffragette movement, entitled 'Militants Here in Earth', which claimed that female suffrage was inevitable, and attacked some of the arguments against it. The English Review was not alone in its support for the suffragettes; it was unusual, however, in its recognition of the importance of working class suffragism. "The great weight of the Suffragette Movement has been that it has had its basis in the hearts of the poorer people."¹ *The Critical Attitude* returned to defence of the suffragettes in January 1910, criticizing the "ostrich called the Liberal party" for hiding "from itself that there exists among women any serious desire for the franchise."²

Ford's most forceful criticism of contemporary domestic politics came in the first two issues of 1910. By this time he had lost the editorship of the review, but was exercising a kind of caretaker editorial role; perhaps his imminent departure gave an extra edge to his writing. The January editorial is a fierce attack on the current state of party political strife and on the press associated with each party for exacerbating the "odious features of the

¹ Ibid., Aug. 1909, 140.

² Ibid., Vol. IV, Jan. 1910, 335.

contest."¹ The final article, 'Declaration of Faith', which appeared under the pseudonym Didymus in February 1910, is less angry and more resigned in tone. Acknowledging that he was "by temperament an obstinate, sentimental and old-fashioned Tory,"² Ford explained that he had not voted for the last twelve years and would not be voting in the forthcoming elections because neither party seemed to him to have the good of the nation at heart. Ford's article is followed by a long and passionate defence of the democratic ideal by Arnold Bennett, in which he castigates both the self interest of the wealthy and the apathy of the masses. Bennett argued for a democratic philosophy which accepted "that every adult man and woman is potentially capable of self-government, and that every adult man and woman must learn, by practice, to take a share in the general government."³ The combined effect of the two articles in what was in effect Ford's valedictory appearance as editor is to give the impression of a review which cared passionately about the quality of contemporary social and political life, and of a commitment which was rather more than the padding exercise which Ford later suggested it was. The English Review under Ford was never a purely cultural production.

There can be little doubt, however, that the major concern of the review *was* cultural. If the political aspects of the review's articles were concerned to examine the quality of the nation's political and social life, then much of the cultural content was chosen to reveal the quality of the nation's cultural identity. The main tool for the articulation of the principles for assessing this were the editorials, several of which were later selected and published by Ford in 1911 as The Critical Attitude.

¹ Ibid., 330.

² Ibid., Feb.1910, 544.

³ Ibid., 558.

The first series of cultural editorials ran from December 1908 to March 1909, that is during the period when Ford had unfettered control of the review. Appearing under the title, 'The Function of the Arts in the Republic', they offered a kind of blue print for what the arts could achieve. Not surprisingly, the very first editorial took literature as its subject, though it distinguished between merely inventive literature and the imaginative literature which Ford valued more highly. "The functions of inventive literature are to divert, to delight, to tickle, to promote appetites; of imaginative literature to record life in terms of the author - to stimulate thought."¹ Ford cited Henry James as an example of the imaginative writer he most admired, because he was "so single-minded in the effort to express, so felicitous and so successful in expressing in imaginative terms all that is most real, most permanent and most fugitive in the life around him."² The January editorial had drama as its subject, but Ford used it for what was probably the most strongly worded attack he ever wrote on what he perceived to be the general dearth of cultural and intellectual activity in contemporary life. "Indeed a person from another world seeking to estimate the level of intellectual appreciation in England today... would be overwhelmed by the fact that in this proud, wealthy and materially polished civilisation there was visible ... no trace, no scintilla, no shadow of a trace of the desire to have any kind of thought awakened."³ Only in the plays of J.M.Barrie and G.B.Shaw and in the music hall performances (which he attended regularly so that he could deal with pressing editorial affairs of the review) did Ford find "any form of pulse stirring ... any form of any consummate expression of an art."⁴

¹ Ibid., Vol.I, Dec. 1908, 159.

² Ibid., 158.

³ Ibid., Jan.1909, 320.

⁴ Ibid.

The third editorial in February dealt with music, and Ford was almost as despairing about the status and achievement of contemporary music as he was about literature and drama. Again, he found the greatest vigour in "the popular song of today", which "with its more characteristic rhythms and its occasional real rendering of feeling is at least an expression of something like the emotional life of the people."¹ There appears to be a certain contradiction between Ford's expressed desire for imaginative literature of the kind exemplified by Henry James, and the more popular culture represented by music hall and song, though in his own mind, Ford reconciled such differences by seeing both categories as being concerned with the accurate rendering of contemporary feeling. It is perhaps surprising, given Ford's musical background and abilities - his father was a musicologist, and Ford himself played the piano and composed² - that The English Review did not offer a wider coverage of contemporary musical activity. Though to some extent this deficiency was made good in The Transatlantic Review, the explanation is that for Ford, culture resided primarily in the written word, and particularly in prose fiction and poetry; other art forms were simply subsidiary. This is born out in the last of these early editorials, which ostensibly dealt with the plastic arts, but which was in fact a diatribe against the general lack of recognition and funding for all art forms, and especially literature. It ended with a kind of declaration of faith for the review in its efforts to improve the situation. "The Art of Letters in England has practically no social weight and practically no contact with the life of the people. It is with the attempt to form such a meeting place that the English Review has set out upon its career."³

¹ Ibid., Feb. 1909, 565.

² Ford's musical talents are discussed, and the manuscripts of two of his songs are reproduced in Sondra J. Stang and Carl Smith, ' "Music for a While": Ford's Compositions for Voice and Piano', Contemporary Literature, Summer 1989, Vol.30, No.2, pp.183-223.

³ English Review, Vol.I, Feb. 1909, 797.

Some familiar ideas emerge from these early editorials. The primacy of imaginative literature and the importance of technique, the general lack of cultural activity and appreciation of the arts in contemporary life, and the centrality of culture to the intellectual and emotional health of the nation are all stated here. What the editorials don't stress is the enjoyment which literature could bring to the reader. Since this was a preoccupation of much of Ford's other critical writing, it is a surprising absence in a venture such as a literary review which aimed to convert its public to the benefits of literary culture; the editorial tone of the review is earnest rather than lighthearted.

The same ideas and tone, the latter if anything intensified, are repeated in the later series of cultural editorials, which appeared under the heading, 'The Critical Attitude'. The first was 'The Two Shilling Novel' in which Ford bewailed the impoverished state of the English writer, the general lack of appreciation of literature, and the effect of the falling price of the novel, which meant that for publishers, sales from a popular novel could no longer subsidise more imaginative fiction. He also attacked the conservatism of publishing houses which were reluctant to take shorter novels, the kind in which "every superfluous word is meticulously excised, in which every episode is of value to the story."¹ One of the functions of his review was, according to Ford, to provide a market for fiction between 30,000 to 40,000 words which would otherwise be difficult to publish, though in fact only his own novel The Call at approximately 45,000 words, came anywhere near fitting this category.²

In October, the review contained the first of a two part editorial on 'English Literature of

¹ Ibid., Vol.III, Sep. 1909,, 320.

² For example, Stephen Reynolds' The Holy Mountain was about 80,000 words, while Granville Barker's 'Georgiana' even though it was serialised in two installments, was only 8,000 words.

Today' , which aimed to distinguish between "the writer of the commercial book and the writer of the book which shall be the work of art."¹ What readers wanted from a novel, claimed Ford, was a "rendering of life" but this was difficult for the writer since "the characteristic of modern life that is most appalling is its inability to sustain any protracted mode of thought."² It was the function of the writer "to awaken thought in the unthinking."³ This editorial contains a summary of one of Ford's central concepts for the function of literature, which was to enable the reader "to be brought really into contact with our fellow men, to become intimately acquainted with the lives of those around us." In the complexity of modern life, the imaginative writer was needed to save us from the "danger of losing alike human knowledge and human sympathy."⁴ The second part of this editorial in November tried to illustrate this general principle by a discussion of individual writers. For example, Ford singled out three dramatists, Granville Barker, Galsworthy and Shaw because they attempted "to present us with really human figures caught in the toils of vicissitudes really human."⁵ He also praised James, Conrad, Moore, Galsworthy, Kipling and Wells because they provided some evidence that "there exists any school of conscious literary Art in England today" and warned that this kind of art was "almost an impossibility today. With the standard and cost of living increasing daily and the contempt for the imaginative writer daily increasing too, it becomes almost impossible for the novelist to remain the stern scientist that he should be."⁶

¹ Ibid., Oct. 1909, 482.

² Ibid., 483.

³ Ibid., 486.

⁴ Ibid., 488.

⁵ Ibid., Nov. 1909, 655.

⁶ Ibid., 669.

'The Passing of the Great Figure' in December 1909, equated the demise of the literary giant with an increasing general thoughtlessness. Ford explored the impact of a large reading public and the cheapness of book production on the publication of imaginative writing and concluded that there was no market for the kind of writing which he valued. "An immense reading public has come into existence, and the desire of those who cater for it is not to promote thought, but to keep it entertained."¹

'The Critical Attitude' in January, 1910, perhaps because of the change of editor, is something of a hotch potch; even the list of its contents has 'etc.' after it, suggesting that it was simply a dumping ground for a set of disparate topics. One of the subjects was 'The Libraries and the Reading Public' in which Ford combined two familiar and longstanding targets, commercial exploitation and a lowering of literary standards. "For literature as such the circulating library does nothing and cares nothing."² He argued that because circulating libraries required works to be "produced at the lowest conceivable price", high class expensive books would soon become extinct. Railway bookstalls were similarly attacked, with the additional accusation that they sold "an immense amount of silly lewdness disguised as fiction."³

The most powerful 'Critical Attitude' is the last; it is Ford's cultural valediction to the review. In it, he restated its aims, "chief among these being the furthering of a certain school of Literature and of a certain tone of thought."⁴ While these were part of Ford's life long aims for literature, he clearly felt, as he was forced to give up his review, that it had

¹ Ibid., Vol.IV, Dec. 1909, 109.

² Ibid., Jan.1910, 339.

³ Ibid., 340.

⁴ Ibid., Feb. 1910, 531.

not succeeded, calling it "a splendid forlorn hope."¹ It had failed because it had proved impossible to inculcate a critical attitude in the English. Even when critics had appeared

they have been listened to with dislike and a show of respect. Then they have been patted out of the way. If a slug should enter a bee-hive, these industrious insects ... will cover him with wax. They pack the wax down, they smooth it over; they extinguish, in fact, that poor slug until he reposes beneath a fair monument, a respectable protuberance from which escape neither groans nor foul odours. Now our islands are the bee-hive, and what is the critic in England ... but just a slug?²

The powerful, almost obsessive imagery is a measure of Ford's anger, both at the absence of critical attitude, and at the failure of his review to generate it. His anger, was not despairing, however, since this was a battle which he continued to fight for the rest of his life. Moreover, this last cultural editorial also contains a kind of declaration of faith in the function of the critic, acknowledging the difficulties to be faced, but also declaiming the rewards. Part of this declaration has been cited in Chapter one; it is worth quoting it again and in full.

For nothing is more difficult, nothing is more terrible than to look things in the face. We have to be ready to recognize, and if we are strong enough to acclaim, that things seeming hideous may embody a New Beauty. We have to watch modern life sweeping away the traditions that we love, the places that we deemed hallowed; we have to consider that it is blowing away ourselves as if we were no more than a little dust. And yet, if we have consciences, we must seek to perceive order in this disorder, beauty in what shocks us.³

This reads almost like a Modernist manifesto, and is impressive both for its courage and far sightedness. However, though it may have been one of the vehicles through which a Modernist literary movement became possible in this country, The English Review was not in itself a Modernist review.

The reputation of The English Review is, of course, based on the range of imaginative

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., 532.

³ Ibid., 534.

literature it published. What is less often acknowledged is the force and consistency of its social as well as its cultural principles, both of which are marked by their democratic ideals and their concern for excellence. Art should be concerned with, as well as available to ordinary individuals and not an élite few, and it should represent the best that is available. This excellence will be achieved by careful attention to technique and should never be sacrificed to commercial considerations. There is nothing in the editorial principles outlined here which is inconsistent with the main thrust of Ford's critical principles, and such a declaration as that quoted above, places Ford in the vanguard of critical opinion prepared to respond to new forms of writing. The question remains about how far Ford's choice of literary contributions for his review actually were as advanced as this critical ideal or even whether the review satisfies his other critical principles.

Chapter 7 The Literary Contents of The English Review

Poetry

The first item in both the reviews edited by Ford was poetry. His criticism of a great deal of poetry was that it was too consciously literary, too much written in temples rather than on omnibuses, and that it did not bring its readers into contact with their fellow men. While some of the poetry which Ford chose for the review stays admirably clear of such criticisms, and is written in "the language of my own day"¹, it has to be said that too much of it all too obviously had these failings.

Most of the poetry was contemporary though Ford did publish two poems posthumously. D.G.Rossetti's 'The Ballad of Jan Van Hunks' which appeared in January 1909, is faintly grotesque and concerns a wager with the devil; some observers felt that Ford had done Rossetti a disservice by publishing it. Since it appeared with a facsimile of the manuscript and a cartoon of Rossetti by Ford Madox Brown, Ford may simply have wanted to demonstrate the continuity and tradition of English culture and the part his own family played in this rather than make a particular point about Rossetti's merit as a poet. The other posthumous poem was Francis Thompson's 'Absence', an acutely melancholy love poem, which appeared in January 1910 and perhaps relied too heavily on Thompson's reputation.

The bulk of the poetry chosen by Ford was by established poets, although there were the occasional gaps. Kipling, for example, was "omitted because we could not pay his prices."² There were three poems by Hardy. 'A Sunday Morning Tragedy', which appeared on the first page of the first issue, is a melancholy ballad about a young unmarried pregnant girl,

¹ Ford Madox Ford, Collected Poems (London: 1914), p.28.

² Thus to Revisit, p.58.

whose mother arranges an abortion for her because she thinks the father of the unborn child will not marry her; he returns to offer her his hand in marriage on the morning of her death. This poem appealed to Ford not just because it had been rejected by another journal, but because it was an example of the kind of literature which he advocated in the editorial of the first issue as adding to our knowledge "of the lives and aspirations of the poor man."¹ Two more Hardy poems appeared in April 1909, and although less weighty, depicted a melancholy contrast between past pleasure and present pain.²

Ford published three poems by W.B. Yeats in February 1909. 'On a Recent Government Appointment' contrasts the vigour and freedom of a squirrel with the poet's own depression and despondency at recent government action. 'At Galway Races' and 'All Things Can Tempt Me' explore the difficulties of a poet's vocation in a modern world, and the first refers specifically to the deadening effects of commerce.

We, too, had good attendance once,
Hearers and heartners of the work;
Before the merchant and the clerk
Breathed on the world with timid breath.³

The second links the current political problems in Ireland with the loss of poetic inspiration, "the seeming needs of my fool-driven land" making the act of writing "unaccustomed toil."⁴ All three poems identify the difficulties facing a writer and locate the source of these difficulties in contemporary social and political problems. Goldring claimed that Ford included the poems simply out of respect for Yeats' reputation⁵, but

¹ English Review, Vol.I, Dec. 1908, 161.

² The poems were 'The Two Rosalinds' and 'Reminiscences of a Dancing Man'.

³ English Review, Vol.I, Feb.1909, 387-388.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ South Lodge, p.49.

Yeats' concern for what he saw as contemporary cultural crisis had much in common with Ford's own fears.

Some of the other poetry by established writers is simple, uncomplicated and accessible; this is true of the poems by Galsworthy which appeared in February, June and November of 1909. Some contributions show the variety of which a poet was capable, as with the five poems by Walter de la Mare in February 1909, which reveal both turgid melancholy and a delightful sense of fun. But much of the poetry is consciously literary, self-indulgent and full of a romantic melancholy. Ethel Clifford's 'The Dryad' (March 1909), T. Sturge Moore's 'NoonVision' about Apollo in pursuit of a maiden, and Dollie Radford's 'Four Sonnets', about the darkness of the soul after loss of love and hope (May 1909) are examples of the kind of poetry which Ford theoretically deplored. This suggests either that Ford was more in sympathy with contemporary poetic styles and subject matter than he was willing to admit, or that he had an astute sense of what was popular even though it wasn't in tune with his own taste; the three poets referred to above were all well known (and not simply to Ford) at the time.

It may have been the second alternative which explained why The English Review under Ford published poems by nine out of the seventeen contributors to the first volume of Georgian Poetry which appeared in 1912¹. This volume was "issued in the belief that English poetry is now once again putting on a new strength and beauty."² The anthology was popular and sold sufficiently well to go into several editions and to generate the demand for subsequent volumes. It could be argued that through the poetry published in

¹ The nine poets were: Brooke, de la Mare, W.H. Davies, Flecker, Lawrence, Gibson, Sturge Moore, Galsworthy and Chesterton.

² Georgian Poetry 1911-1912, ed. Harold Munro (London: 1912), Prefatory Note.

the review, Ford had helped to establish both an awareness of contemporary poetic writing and a market for it. Certainly, he desired to restore the poet to the ear of the public, but much of the poetry, (including, it has to be said, some written by the Georgian poets) which the review published did not accord with his own ideals of poetic function and language.

Sometimes the juxtaposition of poems within a single issue of the review is extraordinary. In July 1909, for example, four 'Songs of the Shame of Labour' by Thomas Burke, remarkable for their working class settings, colloquial language and pungent criticisms of social injustices, were sandwiched between Laurence Binyon's 'Love's Portrait', a romantic melancholy lyric about love as an escape from world-weariness, and F.S. Flint's linked series of love poems, 'The Net of Stars', which give little hint of the imagist theory of economy and accuracy. There is nothing quite like the Burke poems anywhere else in the review; their sardonic humour, critical tone and total absence of sentimentality can be seen as a genuine response to the absence of literature "which gives any insight into the inner workings of a poor man's world."¹

I seen him chip the Unemployed,
 When they was up for making rows.
I seen him bait their starving wives,
 And rot the poor man's marriage vows.
Yes, there he sits, the well-fed ape,
With cops to cheer his cheapest jape -
 The blasted joker!²

Binyon's and Flint's romantic feelings seem effete and irrelevant when read in the context of this attack on the intolerance of a London magistrate, though how far Ford's juxtaposition was mischievous in intent is difficult to decide, since there is no evidence,

¹ English Review, Vol. I, Dec. 1908, 161.

² *Ibid.*, Vol II, July 1909, 636.

either here, or in the layout of The Transatlantic Review , that he used this kind of detailed ordering of contributions as an editorial tool.

It is often claimed that one of Ford's achievements in The English Review was his recognition of new young talent, and it is true that the careers of Ezra Pound and D.H.Lawrence were helped by the review's publication of their poetry. The first Pound poems appeared in June 1909, and were free versions of some troubadour songs which were then enjoying something of a vogue¹. 'Sestina; Altaforte', with its modern idiom - "Damn it all! All this our South stinks of peace" - and its celebration of violence and bloodshed - "Hell grant soon we hear again the swords clash" - is futuristic in tone and attitude, despite its medieval form and mask. Three more poems by Pound appeared in October, and a further three in January 1910. 'The Yearly Slain', 'The Spear' and 'To be Sung Beneath a Window', later appeared as the first three poems of Canzoni of Ezra Pound, published in 1911. Mizener records Ford's horror at the artificiality of style and the irrelevance of subject matter, which caused him to roll on the floor in anguish when Pound read them to him prior to the book's publication². Given Ford's reaction in 1911, it is perhaps surprising that he included them in the review in the preceeding year. He did, however, recognize and admire Pound's enthusiasm for 'Literature' - the two men remained lifelong friends - and the energy with which Pound launched himself on the London literary scene was an antidote to the apathy which Ford felt was afflicting English literature, which was in itself sufficient justification for providing Pound with an outlet. Ford also asked Edward Thomas to review Pound's Personae, a task which Thomas filled uneasily. "It is easier to enjoy than to praise Mr. Pound, easier to find fault with him,

¹ Hugh Kenner, The Pound Era (London: 1971), p.77.

² Mizener, p.216.

easiest to ridicule," he wrote, though he went on to praise Pound's originality and promise¹.

Lawrence's poetry first appeared in the review in November 1909. Written while Lawrence was a schoolmaster in Croydon, and to some extent drawing on his experiences there, the poems contain a combination of relaxed conversational language and moments of dramatic intensity of feeling. 'Dreams Old and Nascent' contrasts his present environment of the classroom with images of past and future. 'Discipline' is a more sombre poem, recording the resistance of his pupils to his ideas, and seeing this as an image for a general indifference to new thinking. For Ford, Lawrence in these poems revealed himself as a writer who responded vigorously to the details of contemporary life, and who felt that art and creativity were an essential part of it. The two remaining poems, 'Running Barefoot' and 'Trailing Clouds' are descriptions of his landlady's baby daughter, and are remarkable for their lucidity, lightness and vivid imagery. The rhythms are apparently casual yet carefully controlled, and the images drawn from the natural world - the baby's feet "cool as syringea buds" and the baby clinging to the poet's arm "as a drenched bee/ Hangs numb and heavy from the bending flower" - convey a warmth of emotion which never slips into sentimentality².

Lawrence's poetry in the review represents a concern with contemporary life and culture, but also exemplifies the "clarity of diction" and "the distinction of individuality" outlined in the review prospectus as well as conveying the sense of a quiet intimate conversation which Ford felt was the ideal poetic voice. Lawrence, perhaps even more than Pound, offered the review's readers a new kind of poetry.

¹ *English Review*, Vol.II, June 1909, 627.

² *Ibid.*, Vol.III, Nov.1909, 565.

It is perhaps not surprising that in the only two poems of his own which appeared in the review, Ford used the approach of these two younger poets, adopting the mask of the one and the quiet conversational tone of the other. These he published under the pseudonym, F.M.Hurd in February 1910, which was the last issue with which he was concerned. 'The Exile' is in many ways very like Pound's early troubadour poetry; in it, the poet assumes the mask of a medieval man whose fortunes have declined.

My father had many oxen
Yet all are gone.
My father had many servants
I sit alone.¹

The tones, rhythms and language of this poem are lucid and conversational with the patterning skilfully disguised. Yet the poem is marked with an unmistakeable sense of personal tragedy: "with heavy tears on my eyelids and the weary sighs in my mouth" can be read as Ford's own statement of personal crisis and longing for escape from professional and personal pressures. The second poem, 'To Gertrude', can also be read as a poem of farewell, in which the poet acknowledges the pressures on him. Ostensibly a love poem addressed by an older poet to a much younger woman, it conveys a sense of melancholy at tasks not yet finished and unlikely now to be completed. Given the extent to which Ford's own poetry so exactly fulfills all his requirements for poetic writing, it is somewhat surprising that there isn't more of it in the review. It may be that he simply wasn't writing a great deal of poetry during The English Review period, which were extremely stressful years for Ford; Harvey shows a gap in his published poetry between December 1908 and December 1911². The gap does, however, seem to be a missed opportunity.

One other young poet published by Ford in the review was Rupert Brooke; the September

¹ Ibid., Vol. IV, Feb. 1910, 383.

² Harvey, pp.162 and 170.

1909 number contained four poems written by him during his last year as a Cambridge undergraduate - 'Sleeping Out: Full Moon', 'The Song of the Moon', 'Blue Evening' and 'Finding'. Although Brooke was president of the University Fabian Society at the time, the poems in no way engage with contemporary social problems. They are introspective, and express an intense and self-indulgent personal longing, of which the following stanza from 'Blue Evening' is an overpowering example:

My restless blood now lies a-quiver,
Knowing that always, exquisitely,
This April twilight in the river
Stirs anguish in the heart of me.¹

Ford may have felt that the poems satisfied his need for 'earnestness of purpose' or he may have known of Brooke's concern for "what poetry really meant, how it solved all the problems of conduct and settles all questions of values."² He and Brooke did, after all, have Fabian contacts in common. The inclusion of Brooke's poems, between Pound's first contribution in June and Lawrence's in November, can be seen either as an example of Ford's catholic tastes and inherent romanticism, or as an aberration of judgement. It also confirms that much of the poetry which he selected for the review reveals some inconsistencies between his avowed literary ideals and his editorial practice.

Fiction: Novels.

Serialisation of novels in reviews was a long established custom, though some newer journals such as The New Age and The Albany did not provide this extended presentation of fiction. Ford was, in retrospect, quite cynical about the policy of serialisation. "We jammed in an enormous slice of serial, not because we believed that anyone ever wanted

¹ Ibid., Vol.III, Sept. 1909, 196.

² Edward Marsh, Memoir in The Collected Poems of Rupert Brooke (London: 1918), p.xxx.

to read a serial, but because we believed that the publicity might be useful to the novelist."¹ In practice, however, the four novels serialised in the review explore areas of contemporary life which deeply concerned Ford. They provide in their different ways a view of contemporary life, revealing its lack of culture and the general fragmentation of human existence, the increasing influence of commercialism on literature and life and the struggle by women to assert their independence.

H.G.Wells' Tono-Bungay, which ran in the first four issues, depicts an England in a state of slow but remorseless decay. The England of the stately home, represented by Bladesover, still has some power, but its influence has largely been replaced by "greedy trade, base profit seeking, bold advertisement."² This commercialism, which Ford attacked consistently in the editorials of the review, is symbolised in the novel, not only by the eponymous patent medicine, but also by the increasing suburban sprawl - "the unorganised abundant substance of some tumorous growth,"³ - and by the radio active 'quap', "that creeps and lives as a disease lives by destroying; an elemental stirring and disarrangement, incalculably maleficent and strange."⁴ Not only does it ruin the fortunes of the novel's protagonist, George Ponderevo, but it is used by Wells to represent the destruction of cultural values, "the decay of our culture ... in society, a loss of traditions and distinctions and assured reactions."⁵ The form of the novel, too, reflects the fractured and fragmented structure of contemporary society. "I warn you this book is going to be something of an

¹ English Review Book of Short Stories, p.vii.

² H.G.Wells, Tono-Bungay, (London: 1909, reprinted 1962), p.341.

³ *Ibid.*, p.198.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.294.

⁵ *Ibid.*

agglomeration ... And it isn't a constructed tale I have to tell, but unmanageable realities."¹ But unlike Ford's editorials which suggested that only culture could save the nation, Tono-Bungay sees the only alternative to "the note of crumbling and confusion" to be change through science, and that is symbolised by an instrument of war, a destroyer, "stark, swift, irrelevant to most human interests."²

Stephen Reynolds' novel, The Holy Mountain, which ran from April to July 1909, is essentially a fantasy in which a hill in Wiltshire is accidentally and miraculously translated to a London suburb, and, at the end of the novel, back again, but the novel provides an extremely comic account of both provincial and commercial responses to this miracle. The criticism of individual greed, provincial narrow mindedness and the corrupt vulgarity and exploitativeness of the popular press is savage and funny. But the novel also illustrates the tragedy of small lives which are caught in vast commercial undertakings, and represents, in fictional form, many of Ford's own concerns about the destructive force of commercial values.

Ford's own novel A Call ran from August to November, and seems, by comparison with the novels of Wells and Reynolds, ponderous and humourless. Its subtitle is 'A Tale of Two Passions' and the novel explores some of the ideas which are handled more confidently in The Good Soldier - passion, personal unhappiness in unsuitable relationships and the strains imposed by the need to observe the conventions of polite society. The novel shows society in Edwardian London to be fractured and vulnerable; surface manners hide a deep unease. The novel eschews the omniscient narrator, and the events of the story are

¹ Ibid., pp.21-22.

² Ibid., p.345.

recorded as if access to the truth is limited and the ending uncertain. When the novel appeared in book form in 1911, Ford added an 'Epistolary Epilogue' in which he explained that he had not provided the kind of elucidation which some readers clearly felt to be necessary, because "for a writer to intrude himself between his characters and his reader is to destroy to that extent all the illusion of his work."¹ His aim was "to render a little episode - a small 'affair' affecting a little circle of people ... He desired neither to comment nor to explain."² Ford's literary principles - the withdrawal of the writer's presence, the idea that fiction should render an 'affair' - were strongly held, and repeated throughout his writing career, but in A Call, the marriage between theory and practice has not been fully achieved.

Violet Hunt's Wife of Altamont which began in December 1909 and ran until March 1910, after Ford had left the review, is an extraordinary mixture of concern for contemporary social issues and of melodrama. The novel explores and deplores the influence of the gutter press, the contrasts between industrial and polite society and between high and low life, and it engages with questions of women's independence. Hunt's presentation of Betsey Altamont is a study of a modern, unconventional woman who, for example, seeks out her husband's mistress and children to offer them shelter and employment and who refuses a new suitor until he has lost his fortune. The writing is frequently funny at the expense of social conventions, but much of the novel's force is dissipated by the melodrama of the plot - Betsey's husband murders his natural father and commits suicide in prison while awaiting the death sentence - and by the contrived happy ending which sits uneasily on the novel's social commentary.

¹ Ford Madox Ford, The Call (London: 1911, reprinted Manchester 1984), p.162.

² Ibid., p.163.

Although only two of the four novels which appeared in the review are in print today, all four of them fulfill Ford's requirement that the novel brings us "really into contact with our fellow men, to become intimately acquainted with the lives of those around us."¹ They all engage fully with contemporary social issues, including the influence of commercialism, the invasion of the popular press and the role of women. Perhaps only Tono-Bungay has the kind of vision which transcends the Edwardian period which produced it, but there is a greater consistency between theory and practice in the novels than in the poetry which Ford selected for the review, and all the novels offer a good read, which is more than can be said for some of the poetry.

This consistency is reinforced by a lengthy article, in French, by Camille Mauclair on 'Le Roman Français Contemporain', which ran across two issues in June and July 1909. Mauclair, like Ford, was concerned with problems facing writers of imaginative fiction. "Malgré cette production énorme et peut-être à cause d'elle, le roman subit en ce moment une grande crise, et traverse une période d'irrésolution et de fatigue."² Mauclair, again like Ford, complains about a lack of critical attitude and like Ford deplores the lack of effort which readers are prepared to invest in their reading and the lack of rewards for the serious novelist. "Le roman sérieux, écrit avec art et profondément composé et pensé, exige de l'auteur un effort que la bonne volonté du lecteur recompense mal."³

¹ Critical Attitude, p.66.

² English Review, Vol. II, June 1909, 614.

³ Ibid., 615.

Fiction: Short Stories

The variety and quality of other fiction in the review is impressive. Ford chose a range of work, including nineteenth century Russian stories in translation, one story in French, the first published fiction by D.H.Lawrence and stories by most of the leading authors of the day. With the possible exception of Gertrude Bone's 'An Experience' (May 1909) and 'Illumination' (July 1909), both of which were accounts of grief and religious consolation and are overpoweringly pious, and Austin Harrison's melodramatic and predictable story about a bullfighter and a gypsy girl, 'The Puntilla' (January 1910), which Ford no doubt had to include as the work of the incoming editor, all the fiction in the review is still fresh, interesting and of a consistently high quality.

One of Ford's concerns was to demonstrate the continuity and internationality of letters, which is probably why he included several Russian works, all translated by Constance Garnett. Tolstoy's 'Volunteer's Story', which appeared in the first and second numbers, is a simple first person narrative about the attractions and the tragedies of soldiering. 'The Honest Thief' by Dostoevsky, which appeared in May 1909, is a low-key, sparse story within a story about a man who takes in a lodger who in turn tells of taking in a destitute drunk to lodge with him. In the last issue with which he was involved in February 1910, Ford included 'Three Sketches' by Tchekov, which are vignettes, clear, economical and sardonic, about newly weds, young lovers and a prostitute. There were also three simple narratives in English about ordinary Russian life by J.Saturin, who was in fact Ford's sister Juliet Soskice, in the February and September 1909 issues and in the January issue of 1910. Anatole France's short story, 'Les Étrennes de Mademoiselle de Doucine' appeared, in French, in January 1909.

The English Review published three stories by Henry James, including 'The Jolly Corner' in the first issue, which helped to establish the review's reputation. This is a superbly crafted ghost story, but it can also be read as the writer's quest for his 'alter ego', the self he might have been had he stayed in America and followed a business career. In the sense that the story affirms the artist rather than the businessman, it can be read as a response to the commercialism which Ford so deplored. The second story, 'The Velvet Glove', appeared in March 1909, and pokes fun at a titled lady with literary pretensions. Implicitly, the story affirms the seriousness of art, but essentially it is a lighthearted comment on the sycophancy of certain aspects of the literary scene and on the place of beautiful but brainless women in it. The third story, 'Mora Montravers', is longer and appeared in two instalments in August and September 1909. It is a gentle and comic presentation of the conflicts between a staid middle aged couple and their young, beautiful but unconventional niece, and is remarkable for James' sympathetic treatment of suburban respectability when confronted by unfamiliar manners and morals. Apparently dull and ordinary subjects are rendered unusually interesting. No review making such claims for its literary status as The English Review could afford to be without contributions from James, but in addition these stories were, for Ford, examples of the best writing that was available, engaging in some of the issues close to his heart and painstakingly crafted; it was the kind of writing which he felt was needed as a response to cultural inertia.

The list of writers whose short stories were printed in The English Review reads like a kind of Edwardian 'Who's Who' of literature. Galsworthy had two stories, Ella D'Arcy three, while Granville Barker, Walter de la Mare, Arnold Bennett, E.M. Forster, H.M. Tomlinson, Olive Garnett, Edwin Pugh, Gilbert Cannan, Violet Hunt, and Ford and Conrad in collaboration, all had one story in the review under Ford. Subjects, treatment and length vary enormously but certain key features emerge. Many of the stories deal with

the lives of the poor. Galsworthy's 'The Neighbours', (November 1909) is a simple understated story of rural love and hate. Edwin Pugh's 'The Starveling Poet' (December 1909) is a funny yet compassionate tale of an impoverished poet whose generosity to his neighbours is greater than his artistic ability. Gilbert Cannan's two part story, 'Lucy Evans', (December 1909 and January 1910) is a moving account of a Welsh Farmer's daughter and the honesty of her behaviour to her lovers. 'Matador of the Five Towns' by Arnold Bennett (April 1909) offers some impressive observations of working class life and culture in the Potteries, and explores, without a hint of condescension, the importance of football in such a culture. These stories exactly fit Ford's need to have a fiction which reveals the lives of the poor and provides "the comprehension of one kind of mind by another."¹

Other fiction engages with the needs and aspirations of women in a changing world. Granville Barker's 'Georgiana' (February and March 1909) which The Spectator thought was offensive,² has as its female protagonist a woman of independent means who wants to experience sex and motherhood without any of the commitments of marriage. While the story exhibits unconscious class bias, its presentation of Georgiana is frank and open, and is impressive for its recognition of women's sexual needs and desire for independence. Ella D'Arcy's 'Agatha Blount' (June 1909) tells of a girl of good family who enters a convent and leaves because she recognises unfulfilled maternal instincts. The society to which she returns is harsh, uncaring and mercenary, treating women as status symbols and sources of wealth and Agatha is forced to return ignominiously to her convent. Apart from its effective presentation of the narrowness of convent life, the story is impressive for its sympathetic treatment of a woman who does not fit social norms and for its critical portrait

¹ Ibid., Vol I, Dec. 1908, 161.

² Spectator, Feb. 6, 1909, 230.

of a society which sees women simply as marriage pawns.

D.H.Lawrence's 'Goose Fair' which appeared in the last issue of the review which Ford assembled, in February 1910,¹ combines an awareness of working class industrial life with a sensitivity to the difficulties faced by women of both lower and upper-middle classes. It is a bleak tale, which dramatises the fragmentary nature of contemporary life. The graphic opening description of the goose girl driving her recalcitrant flock into Nottingham for the fair, is an example of the vivid yet unsentimental writing "which gives us ... insight into the working's of a poor man's mind."² The story also contains in miniature the themes of class and gender conflict in an industrial setting, observing the tensions and misunderstandings which occur between worker and master, between parents and children and between men and women of both the same and different classes.

There is no real unifying factor for the remaining fiction, unless its sheer diversity can be said to characterise it. It ranges from Violet Hunt's splendid ghost story, 'The Coach' (March 1909) and another ghost story, a reworking of the Don Juan legend set in seventeenth century Granada, by Vernon Lee (January and February 1909) to H.M.Tomlinson's 'The Fog', a quietly atmospheric account of a cargo boat caught in dense fog off Gravesend. E.M.Forster's 'Other Kingdom' (July 1909) is a neat parable about the dangers of trying to possess other people. Ford and Conrad's collaborative effort, 'The Nature of a Crime' (April and May 1909) is a curiously complex and unconvincing account of a man trying to come to terms with guilt. Its main interest lies in the impressionism

¹ 'The Odour of Chrysanthemums', accepted at the same time, did not appear until June 1911.

² English Review, Vol.I, Dec. 1908, 161.

and anecdotal technique which are the hallmarks of much of Ford's fiction, and in its similarities to his novel The Call in the analysis of anguished mental processes. None of the short stories selected by Ford is technically innovative or startlingly original in its subject matter, but the selection does show the variety - of length, of narrative methods and of subject matter - which the form can achieve. By and large, it satisfies Ford's literary and social criteria and provides the reader with a magnificent range of fictional narratives.

Non Fiction

Included in the same section of the review as the fiction and interspersed with it are the non fiction articles, - autobiography, travel accounts and essays, both scholarly and personal. Conrad appears briefly as a reviewer in the first issue of the review with a discussion of Anatole France's 'L'Île des Pingouins', but it is perhaps surprising that Conrad's major contribution to the review is his autobiography rather than fiction, since so much of his fiction first appeared in various periodicals. As an account of the struggles to find himself and his vocation, and as an insight into how the mind of the artist works, Some Reminiscences clearly accords with Ford's concerns for the status of the writer and his interest in the creative process. Conrad presents a stoic view of himself and of the endurance required of him in all phases of his life, and especially as a writer. Ford's publication of the work can also be seen as part of his desire to provide Conrad with a wider audience; he was one of the writers whom Ford felt deserved greater recognition and success, and the lack of it was, for Ford, one of the symptoms of literary crisis. Ford had, of course, worked with and encouraged Conrad as a writer for several years, and the technique used in the reminiscences was that of '*progression d'effet*', or cumulative tension, a fictional device used by both men. Conrad reveals only so much of himself in a given episode and then withdraws; the unsettling of narrative expectation, which is a

feature of so much modernist fiction, is the result.

There is some splendid travel and topographical writing in the review. Some of it is domestic, such as the articles by W.H.Hudson. Ford was an admirer of Hudson's clear and economic prose, and it was no accident that Hudson's account of sunrise at Stonehenge and his meditations on the harsh effects of modern living on the wildlife of Salisbury Plain, appeared in the first issue; it provided a kind of benchmark for measuring the literary standards which Ford sought to obtain in the review. The second Hudson article, 'Goldfinches at Ryme Intrinsica', which appeared in May 1909, similarly contrasts past and present attitudes to wildlife. The May issue also included an account of J.W.Allen's visit to the coalfields and coasts of Wales and of the writer's response to both environments.

Norman Douglas, encouraged by Conrad, submitted several essays on Mediterranean life and history. The first, 'The Island of Typhoeus', which appeared in February 1909, was a curious but very readable mixture of topographical and anecdotal writing about the island of Ischia, where he had been living. 'Sirens', in May, was a history of Greek sirens, recording sightings and speculating on their origins, while 'Tiberius', which appeared in August, was a penetrating essay on the Roman emperor, comparing him to Elizabeth I and discussing the range and accuracy of available source material. All the essays are forceful, intelligent and original, and their publication in the review probably helped to establish Douglas' reputation as a writer. He later became assistant editor of the review under Austin Harrison.

Wyndham Lewis is known, together with Ezra Pound and D.H.Lawrence, as one of Ford's discoveries, though there is little in Lewis' accounts of Polish exiles and circus folk in Brittany to suggest the iconoclasm to come. The three articles, which appeared in April,

May and August 1909, are perceptive, unsentimental and certainly original in their choice of subject matter, and Ford did not hesitate to accept them for publication when Lewis visited him. Whether he was attracted by the choice of estranged and alienated subject, or whether he was able to anticipate the kind of challenge which Lewis would later offer to the cultural establishment, is difficult to decide.

Probably the best known writer of nonfiction was R.B.Cunninghame Graham, whose articles were widely published in Edwardian cultural journals; The English Review published four. 'Andorra', in January 1909, is an account of his travels in the Pyrenees. 'A Sailor (Old Style)' in April, is a character sketch of an elderly admiral, while 'Mirahuano' in July, is an account of a negro poet, Silvio Sanchez, who experiences racial discrimination from the South American whites who admire his poetry. The last contribution, in November, 'The Capture' tells of the relationships between Spaniards and Indians in Brazil. These traveller's tales have a clear narrative thread and also a vivid sense of a direct authorial experience of place; they are graphic, moving and suggest a close relationship between writer and landscape. There are other series of articles on life overseas. 'Two Indian Sketches' by M.N. in August 1909, describe an Indian wedding and a Dasra, or fete, from a European point of view. 'Letters from America' by G.Lowes Dickinson, a Cambridge don, appeared in November and December 1909 and January 1910. Ford may have been attracted to these by Dickinson's expressed aim of conveying "impressions from America ... impressions not judgements."¹

¹ Ibid., Vol III, Nov. 1909, 574.

Despite the complications of Ford's private life, and the fact that his marriage had clearly broken down by the summer of 1909, he published four sets of essays by his wife. With curiously old-fashioned titles such as 'The Art of Dining' (August 1909) and 'The Art of Manners' and 'The Art of Contentment' (September 1909), the essays read more like something from Charles Lamb than from the first decade of the twentieth century. Their interest now resides in the poignant portrait which these essays paint of Elsie's loneliness. Ford may have published them to assuage a guilty conscience and to provide her with some kind of financial help, though no record of payments remains.

This is not an exhaustive account of the non fictional contents of the review, but it may serve to illustrate the range and quality of these contributions. There are very few lapses, and these come relatively late in Ford's career as editor. Gilbert Murray's 'A Pagan Creed' in December 1909 is a long, scholarly and extremely dull essay on the religion of the ancients which would have been better suited to the pages of The Westminster Review. In January 1910, there was an extraordinary ornithological article by Philip Oyler, 'Colour Meanings of Some British Birds and Quadrapeds' which would have been more appropriate to a scientific journal. In the same issue there was a factual but dull account of Hogarth as a topographical painter by E. Beresford Chancellor. The English Review did not have a monopoly on interesting non-fiction, though it sustained a more consistently varied, thoughtful and readable selection of this kind of writing than most of its competitors, with the possible exceptions of The New Age, The Nation and The Albany.

Drama

Partly because it is a performance art, but also because of constraints of length, Edwardian cultural journals published very little drama, and The English Review by and large

followed this trend. An exception was made, however, for Arnold Bennett's four act play, What the Public Wants, which appeared in a special supplement to the July 1909 review. Like Reynolds' The Holy Mountain, Bennett's play is a very funny and scathing attack on the ruthlessness, barbarity and commercialism of newspaper barons. Sir Charles Worgan owns "two London dailies, five popular penny weeklies, three illustrated monthlies, four ladies' papers, four boys' papers and I don't know what else."¹ This list doesn't include any publication remotely like The English Review, and the proprietor's behaviour, too, could hardly be more different from Ford's; he spends "money like water, and we have the largest circulation in the country. We please the largest public. We pay the highest prices. We make the largest profits."² Given the intensity of Ford's own dislike of commercialism and his anxiety about the lack of cultural standards, it is not surprising that he felt Bennett's play deserved a special place in the review.

A short drama of working class life, The Love Child, by Frederick Fenn and Richard Pryce, first produced in 1901, appeared in February 1910, and was perhaps included because it had the required social relevance. Ford also included two short verse dramas, Daily Bread, by W.W.Gibson in August 1909, and The Beggars by C.F.Keary. Neither have the dramatic force or the social relevance of Bennett's play. The drama reviews and the editorial discussions of drama are a further indication that Ford valued drama highly as a literary and a social force, although the primacy of poetry and fiction can be assumed from the placing of poetry as the first item in all the issues of the review and from the sheer quantity of fiction which the review included.

¹ Ibid., Vol.II, July 1909, Special Supplement, 6.

² Ibid., 15-16.

Reviews

Although The English Review carried reviews of plays performed in London, of books and very occasionally of opera and art exhibitions, these reviews were neither as numerous nor as lengthy as might be supposed. Ford was far more interested in creative writing and was impatient with the critic's role. There were, in any case, reviews which specialised in reviewing, and others such as The Spectator, whose reviewing was of such a high standard that Ford would have found it hard to compete. Sometimes the reviewing was intended to bestow prestige on the review, the reviewer and the reviewed, as with Conrad's discussion of Anatole France's 'L'Île des Pingouins' in the first issue, or Edward Garnett's review of The Collected Works of W.B. Yeats in April 1909. Sometimes the reviews were designed to promote one of Ford's friends or protégés; this was the case with Ford's review of Masterman's The Condition of England in August 1909, and Edward Thomas on Pound's poetry in June. Other reviews engaged with particular interests of the editor. In January, 1909, for example, Ford wrote a two and a half page review of Professor Saintsbury's A History of English Prosody. Although he is scathing about Saintsbury's inability to write "so as to make himself reasonably intelligible,"¹ he values the book as a discussion of literary techniques which are usually despised and points out that technique is more a matter of hard work than of inspiration. Generally, the reviewing in The English Review is unremarkable; reviews are clearly seen as less important than original work, and although not explicitly stated, Ford's dislike of scholasticism is manifest in the review's practice of allowing the work of the writer to speak for itself.

¹Ibid., Vol I, Jan. 1909, 374.

The Achievement of The English Review

The major achievement of The English Review was that it construed notions of contemporary cultural crisis and tried to respond to them. The review was not alone in trying to do this but Ford articulated this crisis more forcefully and responded more vigorously than any other editor. Both in his editorials and through the accompanying articles and original works which Ford selected for inclusion in the review, he fought single mindedly to raise awareness of cultural and literary matters and to draw attention to the dangers of trivialisation and commercialism. In this, as in so much of his other work, Ford advocated democratic rather than elitist notions of culture; the best should be more widely available and understood, though massive changes in attitude would be necessary to achieve this. Ironically, Modernism, the major cultural change which took place in the years after Ford gave up the review, was culturally elitist.

Although Ford was forced to give up The English Review, he had little doubt that under his editorship, it had helped to change the cultural climate of the country. After listing some of the writers who had appeared in the review, he described their impact on him:

It was - truly - like an opening world. For if you have worried your poor dear old brain for at least a quarter of a century over the hopelessness of finding, in Anglo-Saxondom, any traces of the operations of a conscious art - it was amazing to find these young creatures not only evolving theories of writing ... but receiving in addition an immense amount of what is called 'public support'.¹

This was written in 1921, and Ford was to a large extent being wise after the event; after, for example, 'The Imagist Manifesto' of March 1913, after the appearance of Blast, in June 1914, after the appearance of 'Prufrock' in 1915 and 'Homage to Sextus Propertius' in 1917. Certainly Ford provided an outlet for Pound, Wyndham Lewis and

¹ Thus to Revisit, p.136.

D.H.Lawrence, but Pound, at least, had enough energy to launch himself on the literary establishment and Lewis and Lawrence were assisted in their early careers by help from other quarters in addition to that given by Ford. The English Review was not an early Modernist review, and, despite Ford's own acceptance "that things seeming hideous may embody a New Beauty",¹ the coming of the Modernist literary movement could hardly have been predicted from a reading of those numbers of The English Review edited by Ford.

The English Review was not, in fact, a new kind of review and the differences between it and other contemporary cultural journals are more of degree than of kind. It did devote more space and provide access to a wider range of imaginative writing than any of its competitors, spanning three generations of writers and emphasising that cultural influences are greater than national boundaries. But, as the discussion in Chapter three has shown, there were precedents for such high cultural projects at the end of the Victorian period. Moreover, several of the journals which were contemporary with The English Review were expressing similar concerns about cultural and social issues, and publishing original work and thoughtful criticism. Even its layout and section headings would have been familiar to a reader who read other cultural journals at the time. The review was not the exclusively cultural and intellectual instrument that Ford sometimes liked to claim that it was, and in fact, some aspects of the contemporary cultural scene, particularly music and the visual arts and music, were largely ignored. Finally, although the review was able to publish work by most of the known, and a few of the unknown writers, of the day, Ford's judgement was not infallible, and as this chapter has shown, he did not always choose work which was consistent with his own literary and cultural principles.

¹ English Review, Vol.IV, Feb.1919, 534.

Fifteen years separated the publication of The English and The Transatlantic Reviews, yet the worlds in which they made their appearances seem separated by far more than this. The great transformer was, of course, the first world war, which altered more than the political map and the physical landscape of Europe; it also radically transformed cultural perceptions and ways of viewing the world. The relative certainties of the Edwardian cultural scene were replaced by visions of a world which seemed fractured, fragmented and uncertain. When, at the beginning of the war, Sir Edward Grey declared that the lamps were going out all over Europe, he spoke more truly than he probably knew, and for many, the "botched civilisation",¹ the waste land which emerged at its end, marked the end of all cultural and moral certainties.

The post war years were particularly difficult in France.² French casualties had been appalling with one and a half million dead, and there were severe political divisions between those French citizens who wished to return to the enjoyment of bourgeois comforts, and those who felt excited and challenged by recent events, particularly in Russia. The first post war elections in November 1919 produced a defeat for the socialists, with the conservative Bloc National obtaining 338 seats. There followed several years with no decisive government and a sequence of presidents and prime ministers, together with a worsening financial situation, partly caused by the repayment of war debts to Great Britain and the United States of America, by the cost of reconstruction and by inadequate German reparations. By the end of 1923 the budget deficit was some 4,000 million francs.

¹ Ezra Pound, 'Hugh Selwyn Mauberley' in Selected Poems 1908-1959 (London:1975), p.101.

² In the account which follows, I have relied heavily on the opening chapter of Herbert Tint, France since 1918, 2nd edn (London:1980).

When Germany, also struggling with severe financial difficulties, asked for a moratorium on reparation payments for a period of three to four years, France retaliated by sending troops to the Ruhr. Militarily this was a disaster, and served to isolate France from her European allies and to enlarge the budget deficit still further. The second post war elections were held in 1924, the year of The Transatlantic Review. No single party achieved a working majority and the Communists held the balance of power. Ministry followed ministry as successive politicians tried to solve the financial situation and the franc continued to fall in value.

The conservative and revolutionary strands in French politics were echoed by similar polarisations in French and particularly Parisian culture, although little of the political turmoil reveals itself in contemporary cultural journals published in Paris or in the first hand expatriate accounts of living in Paris. The capital has long dominated the French cultural and political scene, and during the 1920s, Paris could also claim to be the cultural capital of the world. It was truly metropolitan; one estimate suggests that there were 32,000 permanent American residents and twice as many British in the city in 1924.¹ Eugene Jolas, writing in The Chicago Paris Tribune of June 8, 1924, declared that Paris was "the cerebral crucible of the world."² Ford himself, always a Francophile, remembered the Left Bank as perfection, as "the region of Pure Thought and of the Arts."³

The sheer variety and range of creative talent in Paris in the 1920s is impressive. Some established figures died, Modigliani in January 1920, Proust in November 1922, and

¹ Michael Reynolds, Hemingway: The Paris Years (Oxford: 1989), p.162.

² The Left Bank Revisited: Selections from the Paris Tribune 1917-1934, ed. Hugh Ford (Pennsylvania: 1972), p.96.

³ Ford, Preface to Jean Rhys, The Left Bank and Other Stories (London:1927), p11.

Anatole France, much beloved by Ford and Conrad, in November 1924. But their places were taken by new arrivals who stirred things into cultural turmoil. In 1920, the Dadaists, Francis Picabia and Tristan Tzara, arrived in Paris, as did James Joyce, Ezra Pound and Scott Fitzgerald. Ernest Hemingway and his first wife, Hadley, arrived at the end of 1921 for their first visit, returning briefly to Canada for four months at the end of 1923 for the birth of their son, before taking up residence again in Paris in January 1924. Ford himself came in the middle of November 1922, but only became a permanent resident in September of the following year. Margaret Anderson, editor of the American Little Review, arrived in 1923 and stayed until 1939. In fact, the Americans, some of whom had seen Europe for the first time as soldiers, ambulance or military transport drivers in the war, came in droves, encouraged by cheap tourist passages and an increasingly favourable rate of exchange which enabled them to live very cheaply. They also came to escape the effects of Prohibition, which had begun in 1919 in the United States, and to work as journalists because the lifting of censorship after the Armistice allowed American newspapers to publish Paris editions. Above all, they came because they felt that artistic life in America was moribund and that Paris was the intellectual centre of the universe. Many of them were influenced by the writing of Harold Stearns, and in particular by the book he edited in 1922, Civilization in the United States, which drew attention to what Stearns saw as the intellectual sterility of the States: "the most moving and pathetic fact in the social life of America today is emotional and aesthetic starvation."¹ The long established European cultural heritage seemed very attractive not just to Stearns and other contributors to his book, but to a whole generation of young Americans. Malcolm Cowley spoke for many of them when he wrote that to "young writers like ourselves a long sojourn in France was

¹ Civilization in the United States - An Enquiry by Thirty Americans, ed. Harold Stearns (New York: 1922), p.vii.

almost a pilgrimage to the Holy Land."¹ If France was the Holy Land, Paris was Jerusalem, and it was, wrote Samuel Putnam, "a good deal nearer than New York or Chicago to being the literary capital of the United States."²

Not all the Americans in Paris were new arrivals; some had been settled in Paris for some time. Natalie Barney, for example, took up residence in 1902 and established her literary salon in rue Jacob in 1909. Gertrude Stein and her brother, Leo, arrived in the spring of 1903, devoting their energies and money to the purchase of modern art; they separated in 1913 after Gertrude and Alice Toklas had become lovers and established another literary salon in the rue de Fleurus. Sylvia Beach had lived in Paris from 1902 to 1905, when her father was the pastor of the American Church in Paris, but she returned to Europe in 1915, and opened her bookshop, Shakespeare and Company, in 1919.

Paris, and particularly its Left Bank in the 1920s, was referred to by one writer who experienced it as "a threshold in the sun."³ The description does indeed capture something of the sheer quantity of talent and the exuberance of its creative life. André Gide and Tristan Tzara, Paul Valéry and Ezra Pound, Eric Satie and George Antheil, Nadia Boulanger and Igor Stravinsky, Picasso, Diaghliev, Braque, Breton, Man Ray, Chagall, Brancusi - the list is both long and dazzling. Cultural life in Paris was exciting and enjoyable. Bryher recalled; "It is hard to realise now how new everything was ... We laughed at every body and no idea was sacred."⁴ Stella Bowen recorded on behalf of the

¹ Malcolm Cowley, Exile's Return: A Literary Odyssey of the 1920s (New York: 1934, revised London: 1961), p.102.

² Samuel Putnam, Paris was our Mistress (New York: 1947), p.5.

³ Lloyd Morris, Threshold in the Sun (London:1948), p.215.

⁴ Bryher, The Heart to Artemis (London: 1963), p.207.

expatriates in Paris; "We lived [there] because the French understood how to live far better than we did. Behind our irresponsibility was the background of French shapeliness and realism. We tried to absorb and imitate these things."¹ Part of the excitement arose from the willingness of many creative artists to communicate with and learn from each other. As Malcolm Cowley observed, "It happened that the American writers who admired French literature were confronted by young French writers who admired American civilisation."² In the cafés of the Left Bank, in the range of artistic gatherings and salons, in the bookshops of Adrienne Monnier and Sylvia Beach and in the small presses and cultural journals, a great cultural cross fertilisation took place.

The glamour of Parisien café life is probably much romanticised, but it provided a meeting place for the exchange of ideas, and there are accounts which bear witness to their inspirational power. Hemingway recorded sitting in a café in Place St. Michel in winter, trying unsuccessfully to write one of his stories of Michigan life, and of being inspired by a chance encounter with a young girl. "I've seen you, beauty, and you belong to me now ... and all Paris belongs to me and I belong to this notebook and this pencil. Then I went back to writing and I entered far into the story and was lost in it."³ It was in a Paris restaurant, waiting for James Joyce, that Ford decided that he would never go back to live in England, preferring France where "the Arts are held in great honour."⁴ In addition to being important for allowing contacts between artists and writers, Paris café life was also important for boosting the morale of shaky egos, including Ford's. Sisley Huddleston, Paris

¹ Stella Bowen, Drawn from Life (London: 1941, reprinted 1984), p.156.

² Exile's Return, p.103.

³ Ernest Hemingway, A Moveable Feast: Sketches of the Author's Life in Paris in the Twenties (New York: 1964), p.6.

⁴ It was the Nightingale, p.270.

correspondent for The Times, described Ford at the Closerie des Lilas on Boulevard du Montparnasse, "surrounded by admirers."¹

In addition to the public contacts made through café life, (and many Transatlantic Review contributors were inveterate frequenters of Paris cafés) there were the less public though no less important private gatherings, some of which acquired the status of salons. Using a large inherited fortune, Natalie Barney, an American poet, novelist and dramatist, established such a salon at 20, rue Jacob, which ran for more than sixty years, and served to bring together French and American intellectuals and to provide a forum for women writers. Stella Bowen described the gatherings which she and Ford visited there. They "were always held in honour of one of the arts, and from a semi-circular alcove hung with an antique embroidery, French verse would be spoken, or modern music played ... I also remember listening with respect to M. André Gide, Edmund Jaloux and Paul Valéry and admiring the sangfroid of certain lawless and exotic young American women who, rushing in where angels fear to tread, obtained an excellent response from ces messieurs."² Less overtly lesbian, and certainly less feminist in outlook, were the meetings presided over by Gertrude Stein and Alice Toklas, who held court at 27, rue de Fleurus. Together, these two meeting places enabled contacts to be established and maintained between most of those with literary pretensions in Paris, though more people fell out with or proved resistant to Stein than to Barney. James Joyce, for example, appears not to have met Stein until 1930, though it may well be that two such extreme egoists avoided the personal as well as the literary contact which might have detracted from their own literary prestige.

¹ Sisley Huddlestons, Back to Montparnasse (London: 1931), p.48.

² Drawn from Life, p.155.

The informed cultural exchanges which took place at the homes of Barney and Stein were precisely the kind of contact valued by Ford, although he had not been in Paris long before he established his own meetings. At first, these were at the Three Mountains Press on the Quai d'Anjou, where The Transatlantic Review had its offices in a small gallery. Here, on Thursdays, the Review was 'at home', Stella Bowen "made tea for all and sundry" and Ford, after talking to new contributors, "would descend and spread geniality among the faithful."¹ Later, such gatherings were held in a small dance hall called Bal du Printemps in the rue du Cardinal Lemoine, where, as Stella put it, "the charm of a railway station prevailed with a vengeance since you never knew who would be there. It was a public spot and the word went round."² Indeed it did, and Samuel Putnam remembered that "by reason of the Transatlantic Review and his having published Hemingway, Ford rather dominated the picture ... and, being kindly disposed and wholly free of literary snobbishness, liked to gather about him those who had some respect for writing as an art with a great and noble tradition behind it."³

Among the most effective ways of establishing and maintaining links between European and American culture were the bookshops, La Maison des Amis des Livres, and Shakespeare and Company, run, respectively, by Adrienne Monnier and Sylvia Beach. The first, at 7, rue de l'Odéon, was important not simply as a bookshop and lending library, but also because Monnier encouraged translations into French of writers as different as Francis Thompson, Arnold Bennett, Samuel Butler, Walt Whitman, James Joyce and Ernest Hemingway. The shop was also the meeting place for a whole series of exhibitions,

¹ Ibid., p.117.

² Ibid., p.130.

³ Paris was our Mistress, p.71.

lectures and seminars or 'séances' on major contemporary artists and writers. Valéry-Nicolas Larbaud, for example, led a "Séance consacrée a l'écrivain Irlandais, James Joyce", on December 7, 1921, which included reading "fragments de Ulysses traduits pour la 1re fois en Francais".¹ Monnier supported a range of publishing ventures, including the French edition of Ulysses in 1929. The list of visitors to the shop, which opened in November 1915, reads like a kind of 'Who's Who' of French literature: André Breton and Guillaume Apollinaire in uniform during the war, and afterwards and through the twenties, Jules Romain, Louis Aragon, Philippe Soupault, André Gide, Paul Claudel, Paul Valéry, Leon Paul Forgue and Valéry-Nicolas Larbaud. Louis Galantière, in the Paris Newsletter of The Chicago Paris Tribune for July 29, 1923, described the warmth and welcome Monnier gave to all her readers, with her "passion for books and a sincere devotion to literature." Monnier's shop, like Beach's, acted as a distribution centre for important cultural journals, such as Littérature, Commerce and Le Navire d'Argent.²

Shakespeare and Company opened in 1919, and in 1921 moved to 12, rue de l'Odéon, so that together with La Maison Francaise d'Art et d'Edition at number 16, where Eduard Dujardin edited Les Cahiers Idéalistes Français, the street formed a real cultural centre. Like Monnier's establishment, Shakespeare and Company was as important as a lending library as for selling books, and was influential both in publicising American literature in Paris, and in providing a market for contemporary French writers, most of whom were regular visitors to Monnier's shop on the other side of the street. In fact, Léon Paul Forgue coined the name 'Potassons' - "a nice fat cat as well rounded as a pot" for the regular

¹ Maurice Imbert et Raphael Sorin, Adrienne Monnier et La Maison des Amis des Livres 1915-1951 (Paris: 1991), p.25.

² Monnier was the 'Directrice et Gérante' or business manager of Commerce in 1924, and contributed to Le Navire D'Argent in 1925.

visitors to what Monnier herself called 'Odéonia'.¹ Shakespeare and Company also stocked well known writers such as Conrad, Yeats, Wilde, Kipling, Dickens, Hardy, Poe and James, and was a major distributor of magazines, including The Dial, The Nation, The Chapbook, The New Republic, Poetry, The Egoist, Playboy, The Criterion, The Little Review and The Transatlantic Review. Again, the range of visitors to the shop was impressive, including several who were to be connected with The Transatlantic Review - Hemingway (described by Beach as "my best customer"),² Joyce, Pound, Antheil, Barney, Djuna Barnes, John Quinn and Gertrude Stein (who later withdrew her subscription to express her disapproval of Ulysses). It was, wrote Galantière, "the magnet which draws all those in Paris who are interested in English and American literature and those particularly whose interest is in the literature of today."³ And, of course, despite having no previous experience of publishing, Beach brought out the first complete edition of Ulysses in 1922, which increased the fame and number of visitors to the shop.

Sylvia Beach and Adrienne Monnier were not alone in becoming involved in publishing ventures in Paris; there were a number of small publishing enterprises. For example, helped in 1923 by £14,000 from his father-in-law, Sir John Ellerman, Robert McAlmon expanded his Contact Publishing Company, principally to provide an outlet for exiled writers who were finding difficulty in getting their work into print.⁴ In addition to publishing his own work and that of his wife, the poet Bryher, McAlmon also published Hemingway, William

¹The Very Rich Hours of Adrienne Monnier, trans., with an Introduction and Commentaries, by Richard McDougal (London: 1976), p.38.

² Sylvia Beach, Shakespeare and Company (London: 1960), p.86.

³ Chicago Paris Tribune, July 29, 1923, 22.

⁴ Robert McAlmon and Winifred Ellerman, better known as Bryher, contracted a marriage of convenience in February 14, 1921, so that she could continue a lesbian affair with H.D. under the cover of a heterosexual union.

Carlos Williams, Mina Loy, H.D., and in November 1925, Gertrude Stein's The Making of Americans, parts of which had first appeared in The Transatlantic Review. Contact books were printed by the same Dijon printer, Maurice Darantier, who had printed Ulysses. Another small company, Three Mountains Press, was both printer and publisher. Run by William Bird, European manager of Consolidated Press Association, whose hobby was hand printing, the company used a seventeenth century press for short works. Ezra Pound encouraged Bird to publish works by modern authors, which Pound himself would edit. Pound's original list of authors included T.S.Eliot and Wyndham Lewis, but they both withdrew from the project. Between 1923 and 1925, Three Mountains Press published Pound's Indiscretions, Ford's Women and Men, William Carlos Williams' The Great American Novel, Elimus by B.C.Windeler, England by B.M.G.Adams, Hemingway's In Our Time and Pound's Antheil and the Treatise on Harmony. All the authors except Windeler featured in The Transatlantic Review, and it was Bird who provided Ford with office space for the review in a gallery above his press on the Quai d'Anjou.

What emerges from any examination of cultural activity in Paris in the years preceeding and including 1924, the year in which The Transatlantic Review appeared, is that through a series of overlapping cultural circles, a great range of cultural contacts was possible, and that Ford, and those most closely associated with him on the Review project, had easy access to them. The London in which The English Review had been produced was far from dull and static, but the Paris of The Transatlantic Review was altogether more lively, cosmopolitan and *avant garde*. "Rarely", writes one commentator, "has a time and place so captured the imagination as the Paris of these years ... Our impressions of these years are marked as much by the sense of a self-indulgent hedonism as by the record of an

intellectual fever."¹ Whether The Transatlantic Review reflects either the hedonism or the intellectual fervour will be considered in a later chapter; it may be that The English Review was the more original of the two reviews simply because it had more to do to break new ground. The point to make here is that The Transatlantic Review was sited both temporally and geographically at the centre of a great ferment of creative activity.

¹ Shari Benstock, Women of the Left Bank: Paris 1900-1940 (London:1987), p.4.

One of the major differences between The English Review and The Transatlantic Review is that the latter was aimed at three different readerships in Paris, London and New York; it was, as its advertisements proclaimed rather portentously, "The only Great Review to be published simultaneously in three Capital Cities."¹ It certainly wasn't the only review to be available on both sides of the Channel and on both sides of the Atlantic; one of the functions of bookshops such as Sylvia Beach's Shakespeare and Company was to display and sell a wide range of American and European journals, and The Criterion, for example, regularly published lists of such reviews as might interest its readers. The Transatlantic Review was, however, unusual in being explicitly addressed at readerships in three cities, and not surprisingly, this influenced not only its editorial policy, but also, as will be shown in the next chapter, its commercial viability. Additionally it renders more complex any process of comparison between The Transatlantic Review and other contemporary journals. With The English Review, this process was relatively uncomplicated, since it was only necessary to survey other journals published in the United Kingdom. To assess the achievement of The Transatlantic Review, it is necessary to compare it with contemporary French and American as well as British journals, a process rendered even more complex by the increase in numbers of all such publications in the years which separate the first appearance of the two reviews. Here, the criteria for selection of reviews to survey has been to choose those whose editorial principles and contents illuminate what Ford was trying to achieve in The Transatlantic Review, either because of close similarities, or, in a few cases, because the sharp differences highlight either the extent or the limitations of Ford's achievement.

¹ The Nation, April 26, 1924, 123.

Many of the reviews which were discussed in Chapter 3 were still running, including some of the oldest such as the Edinburgh and Quarterly reviews and the oldest of the monthlies, Blackwood's, though very few of them had been able to sustain the cultural standards which had been apparent in the first decade of the century; Blackwood's editorial was now called, all too appropriately, 'Musings without Method'. The English Review itself, while it still retained its original blue covers, was sadly changed. Ernest Remnant had succeeded Austin Harrison as editor in May 1923, and its emphasis was now placed on political and social comment. Literary criticism was supplied by George Saintsbury and Charles Whibley, both of whom wrote for The Criterion, by St. Loe Strachey, editor of The Spectator, and by Austin Harrison, Edward Carpenter and Richard Church, but generally the review was a shadow of its former self with nothing to distinguish it from other safe mainstream journals.

There were a few journals whose cultural and intellectual standards remained undiminished by time, including, amongst the monthlies, The Fortnightly Review and The Bookman. The former, still under the editorship of W.L.Courtney, was as wide ranging, as thoughtful and as intelligent as it had been in 1908, and the cultural contents for 1924 are impressive, including Alec Waugh on the Neo Georgians (Jan.), Arthur Symonds on John Addington Symonds (Feb.), articles on Byron, Elroy Flecker, Anatole France and Pirandello, an extended obituary of Conrad by G.Jean-Aubry (Sept.), an Edith Sitwell poem and a series of dialogues between George Bernard Shaw and Archibald Henderson on a range of cultural topics. While not primarily a cultural journal, and certainly not *avant garde*, The Fortnightly Review, of all the monthlies left over from the Victorian period, was probably the most impressive in the depth as well as the breadth of its writing, though The

Bookman, too, sustained its ability to combine popular appeal with intelligent and informed comment on literary matters. In August 1923, for example, Gerald Gould's article on 'The New Poetry' discussed Siegfried Sassoon, all the Sitwells, Charlotte Mew and F.S.Flint, and in April 1924 there were articles on Byron, and Arnold Bennett on W.H.Hudson.

Sadly, The New Age, which had once been outstanding for its combination of literary and social awareness, had, since Orage relinquished the editorship in 1922, become largely political, pedestrian and non-descript. Almost the sole exception to this were the weekly articles by C.M.Grieve, (otherwise known as Hugh MacDiarmid) who waged a one man, almost Fordian battle against declining cultural standards, censorship and the growing philistinism of new money. However, three weeklies, The Nation and Athenaeum, The Saturday Review and The Spectator, had survived in good shape. They were remarkably alike in format, length and price, which was sixpence, and in their wide ranging and thoughtful coverage of contemporary social, political and cultural affairs. All claimed to be politically independent, although The Saturday Review and The Spectator expressed conservative views. The music critic of The Saturday Review was Dyneley Hussey, who also wrote for The Transatlantic Review as its London music correspondent, while Gerald Gould, who had contributed to The English Review under Ford, was a regular book reviewer. On May 24, 1924, it published A.E.Coppard's story, 'Alice Brady'; The Transatlantic Review published Coppard's 'The Higgler' in the same month. The Spectator contained impressive reviewing, its reviewers including L.P.Hartley, A.E.Coppard, J.B.Priestley and Conrad (who found Ford's Some Do Not "a bewildering book").¹ Its weekly poem included works by Rimbaud, translated by Edgell Rickword, Rickword's own work, Robert Graves, Edith and Sacheverell Sitwell, W.H.Davies and Arthur Waley's

¹ The Spectator, May 3, 1924, 720.

translations of Chinese verse.

The most impressive of the three was The Nation and Athenaeum, formed in 1921 from a merger of the two papers whose name it bore. Both had been distinguished on their own, The Nation under H.W.Massingham from 1907 and The Athenaeum under Middleton Murry in 1920 and 1921. Together they were a formidable combination, and in 1923, the journal was purchased by J.M.Keynes as an organ for Liberal ideas. Its editor from 1923 to 1930 was H.D.Henderson, with Leonard Woolf as literary editor. It is the calibre of its contributors and the quality of their work which place The Nation and Athenaeum in a class above its contemporary weeklies. Regular contributors included Keynes, Lloyd George, J.B.S.Haldane, E.M.Forster, (who, on April 26, 1924, provided a very funny account of a visit to the site of the British Empire Exhibition two weeks before it opened,) Robert Graves, Clive Bell, Roger Fry and C.F.G.Masterman. Reviewers included Rose Macaulay, Edmund Blunden, Bertrand Russell, Edward Garnett, Arnold Toynbee, L.P.Hartley, Hugh Walpole, Vita Sackville-West and Osbert Sitwell, while there was poetry from Cavafy, Edwin Muir, Edmund Blunden, Robert Graves, Edith Sitwell and Frances Cornford. The journal was closely linked with the Bloomsbury group, which was one of the few cultural circles not accessed or published by Ford, and its concerns were largely restricted to cultural and political life in the United Kingdom. It was neither as international as The Transatlantic Review or The Little Review, nor as *avant garde* as Dada, but for a review which had survived, albeit in an altered form, from an earlier period, it was impressively liberal, both culturally and politically, and revealed through its pages, a formidable range of contemporary literary talent. All three weeklies, despite their different political orientation, were culturally similar, addressing an intelligent, educated and informed readership and offering wide ranging thoughtful commentary and reviews of

mainstream British culture.

English Reviews: Post 1908 and Pre 1924 Journals

Between the first publication of Ford's two reviews a number of cultural journals appeared and disappeared, though sometimes their impact was out of all proportion to their length of life. Their ephemerality, and, in some cases, the irregularity of their appearance may have subtly altered the perception of the nature and function of cultural reviews, making transience and topicality acceptable and even desirable. They included, in the pre-war years, Middleton Murry's Rhythm and its sequel, Blue Review, and Harriet Shaw Weaver's New Freewoman,¹ later The Egoist, which ran until 1919, when, because of rising costs and falling circulation, Weaver abandoned the journal to concentrate on publishing activities.

The most iconoclastic of the small reviews, and also the shortest lived, was Blast, or the 'Review of the Great English Vortex', edited by Wyndham Lewis and priced at half a crown.² Despite the relatively early date - number 1 was published on June 20, 1914 and number 2 in July 1915 - Blast still seems startling, with its dramatic range of type and layout, and its manifesto which cursed the Establishment and the "Britannic Aesthete", and which claimed that its signatories "only Want the World to Live and to feel its crude energy flowing through."³ Although the first number of Blast contained part of Ford's The Saddest Story (later to appear in book form as The Good Soldier), he was not a signatory

¹ This began life in 1911 as The Freewoman, became The New Freewoman in 1913 and The Egoist in 1914.

² The front cover of Number 1 gives the price as 2/6 for each quarterly and 10/6 for a yearly subscription, which suggests that Lewis intended that it should appear more regularly than it did.

³ Blast, No.1, 1914, 7.

to the manifesto, although Richard Aldington, Gaudier Brzeska and Ezra Pound were. Blast published striking new work. The first contained, in addition to several pages of attacks on countries and their cultural institutions, Pound poems, a play by Wyndham Lewis, a longish short story by Rebecca West and black and white reproductions of the work of Edward Wadsworth, Wyndham Lewis, Gaudier Brzeska and Jacob Epstein. The second issue was much shorter and rather more subdued than the first, and included a number of responses to the war by Lewis, Pound and Brzeska, whose death in the trenches earlier that year was reported. Then, as Lewis joined the army, Blast simply ceased to exist. Nothing else quite like it in terms of its iconoclastic attitudes appeared in either England, France or America in the years preceding The Transatlantic Review and it is a useful yardstick against which to measure the achievements of *avant garde* cultural journals of the twenties, such as Dada and Littérature. Ford, as a contributor, knew of it as a possible model, and his inclusion of reproductions of the work of contemporary artists may owe something to the example set by Blast. Its value in a study of Ford's achievement as an editor, is to show what had been achieved in breaking new ground in cultural journalism ten years before Ford's second review was launched and to reveal the conservatism of Ford's approach.

After the war, in 1922, Lewis returned to the challenge of the *avant garde* in a new journal, Tyro. As with Blast, publication was irregular - "to be published every two or three months" - and its focus was more artistic than literary. It was "to be a rallying spot for those painters, or persons, interested in painting" as "a constant and perpetually renewed effort," and it acknowledged the break with the past caused by the war. "No time has ever been more carefully demarcated from the one it succeeds than the time we have entered on by the Great War of 1914-18 ... there is no passage back across ... to the lands

of yesterday."¹ Into the twelve newspaper sized and quality pages of the first issue, which at one shilling and sixpence was expensive, were crammed articles by Wyndham Lewis on Roger Fry's role of 'Continental Mediator', critical essays by T.S.Eliot and Herbert Read, poems by Robert McAlmon, John Adams and John Rodker, and drawings by Lewis, Frank Dobson and David Bomberg. The second number was longer, and although at half a crown, more expensive, better value for money, with 66 pages, plus 17 pages of reproductions and was more conventional in format, including advertisements for such bourgeois objects as hats and furniture. The editorial tone, however, was still defiant, offering a defence of radical, experimental work, and attacking "that unfortunate organization of amateurs - banded together for the ends and for the decrepit joys of amateurishness - that men call, for want of a better word, Bloomsburies."² Eliot again contributed an essay, and there were articles on abstract paintings, Russian artists, plastic art and a 'Lettre de Paris', in French, on the Parisian cultural scene, by Waldemar George. As in the first number, there were poems and reproductions of work by contemporary artists. There was also a reworking of Lewis' 'Some Innkeepers and Bestre' which Ford first published in The English Review; this perhaps offered Ford a precedent for the republication of The Nature of a Crime in The Transatlantic Review. In fact, the second number of Tyro is very like the early numbers of The Transatlantic Review but without the extended fiction and editorial commentary. It seems unlikely that Ford would not have known about it, since he and Lewis had friends as well as contributors in common, although Lewis was not a Ford admirer.

A feature of much cultural journalism in the period under discussion was the extensive use

¹ Tyro, Vol.1, no date, pp.2-3.

²Ibid., no date, Vol.2, 9.

of illustration. In addition to Blast and Tyro, there were the six slim volumes of contemporary poetry, edited by Edith Sitwell, and published as Wheels between 1916 and 1921. Most of the poetry which appeared was written by those who were part of the Sitwells' circle of friends; it was generally gloomy with a strong anti-war feeling about it, which explains the posthumous inclusion of several poems by Wilfred Owen in the fourth volume.¹ Wheels is interesting not simply because it reprinted reviews of some of the poetry which it published together with bibliographies of other poetry by its contributors, but because of the high quality of its design work and especially its covers and endpapers which incorporated witty variations of images of circles and wheels. Wheels as a publishing venture was successful; the first edition of 500 copies at half a crown each, sold well enough to go into a second edition, while 750 copies of the second cycle and 1000 copies of the third were printed.

One of the best illustrated journals was Art and Letters, which ran from July 1917 until the spring of 1920, although its editors, Frank Rutter, Charles Ginner and H. Gilman didn't always succeed in publishing every quarter; there were gaps, for example, in the spring and autumn of 1918, and the journal had three series, all with different layouts, lengths and price as it struggled to find its niche in the market place. The bound volume of the second series, which began in the winter of 1918, when its price had been raised to half a crown, acknowledged these struggles inside the front cover. "This is not our permanent format. As prices become normal and subscriptions accrue, we shall increase our size and an increased size will enable us to increase our scope." The financial policy of Art and Letters is remarkably Fordian in its optimism, but was at least explicit. "No payment for contributions is guaranteed. But the profits on each number will be divided equally among

¹ The poems were 'The Show', 'Strange Meeting', 'A Terre', 'The Sentry', 'Disabled', 'The Deadbeat' and 'Chances'.

editors and contributors. Two thousand subscribers would ensure ordinary rates of payment. Five thousand subscribers would ensure adequate payment." There are no circulation figures available but the fact that the tenth and last issue was in the spring of 1920 suggests that not only were the 2000 subscribers for 'ordinary payment' not forthcoming, but that, even when the price went up to half a crown at the end of 1918, sales did not cover costs.

Art and Letters is remarkable for the consistently high standard of literary and artistic achievement in a relatively small space. In the first series, there were woodcuts by Pissarro and Paul Nash inserted on finer, pale green paper, and drawings by Gaudier Brzeska and Walter Sickert. In the second series there were drawings by Picasso, Brzeska, Modigliani, Augustus John and Wyndham Lewis, who also provided the woodcut for the new dark green cover. Poets included all the Sitwells, Richard Aldington, Siegfried Sassoon, Ford, Eliot¹ and Isaac Rosenberg, who had five poems published posthumously, together with a pencil study. There were literary essays by Eliot on Marivaux and on Marlowe's blank verse, by Douglas Goldring on D.H. Lawrence and by Pound on De Bosschere. Fiction writers included Wyndham Lewis, Katherine Mansfield and Dorothy Richardson. The two numbers of the last series contained many of the same writers and artists, with the addition of poetry by Wilfred Owen and drawings by Jacob Epstein. Art and Letters is different from both of Ford's reviews, since it is shorter and without political and cultural editorial statements; it was available to Ford as a possible model for his second editorial venture, since as a contributor he would have been familiar with it. Arguably, its cultural focus was sharper than that in either The English or The Transatlantic Review, and its grasp of what was currently important in literary and artistic circles, together with its

¹ The poems were: Ford, 'Peace', Winter 1918/19, and, Eliot, 'Burbank with a Baedeker: Bleistein with a Cigar', 'Sweeney Erect', Summer 1919.

uncompromisingly high standards, both of contribution and production, was outstanding.

With the end of the war, there was an upsurge of publication of new journal, some very short lived. For example, The Owl, edited by Robert Graves, ran only to three numbers, in May and October, 1919 and a final Winter Owl in November 1923. Another was Coterie which ran for seven numbers between May 1919 and the winter of 1920-21. It had a distinguished editorial committee which included Conrad Aiken, T.S.Eliot, Aldous Huxley and Nina Hamnett, under the general editorship of Chaman Lill. By the end of 1919, Aiken and Stanley Rypus had become American editors, and Richard Aldington and Wyndham Lewis had joined the editorial committee; Coterie is interesting as an example of collaboration between English and American writers. Like so many of its contemporaries it contained a mixture of poetry, lavish art work, literary essays and reviews and many of its contributors had also contributed to Art and Letters; Ford was not among them.

It is worth citing one further example of a short lived post war journal, the monthly Anglo French Review, which ran from February 1919 to December 1920 and was published in both London and Paris. It had English and French editors, J.Lewis May and Henry Davray respectively and its articles on political, scientific and economic as well as cultural topics appeared in either language, according to the nationality of the contributor. Its editorial policy was very much conducted in the spirit of post war co-operation. "C'est a l'ardente collaboration des peuples alliés que nous devons. Seule, leur union ténace et confronte nous garantira les bienfaits d'une paix heureuse et durable."¹ In many ways, The Anglo French Review was modelled on earlier generalist English reviews, such as The Fortnightly. Though it did place considerable emphasis on the war legacy and on

¹ The Anglo French Review, February 1919, Vol.I, No.1, 1.

international politics, its cultural contents were also impressive. George Meredith's 'Ode to France' translated by Davray, appeared in the first issue, while the second offered Binyon's war poems, an appreciation of Emile Verhaeren, the Belgian poet much admired by Ford, who died in 1916, and Arthur Symons on Nina de Callias. Subsequent issues included contributions by Richard Aldington, James Joyce, ('Balinhofstrasse', a poem) F.S. Flint in French, Robert Graves, V. Sackville-West, Natalie Barney, Amy Lowell, Valéry Larbaud and Mallarmé. The review was thoughtful, wide ranging and genuinely international, and it is in its conscious attempt to address an international audience that it anticipates The Transatlantic Review. Its failure was almost certainly commercial; in April 1920 its price rose from half a crown to four shillings, a sure sign of a journal in financial difficulties.

None of the journals discussed in this section were extant when Ford commenced his second editorial project, though some of them would have been known to him. Their importance here lies in the kind of models available to him and lessons which he could learn from their often brief histories, namely that such journals could be exclusively cultural, that they could contain a range of contemporary art work, that they could be international in focus and editorial policy and that they were not commercially viable. Ford seems only to have availed himself of these models to a limited extent and certainly showed no signs of learning anything from their commercial failure.

English Post-war Reviews Contemporary with The Transatlantic Review

In July 1919, the first number of The Chapbook appeared, edited by Harold Monro, formerly editor of The Poetry Review and Poetry and Drama. Its aims were stated inside the front cover; it was intended that each issue would be "of separate interest, and

complete in itself. At the same time, a definite continuity will be preserved so that the six issues of any half-year will form a volume recording that year's production in poetry and drama, a critical survey of contemporary literature and numerous examples of the creative work of the present period." The Chapbook certainly succeeded in achieving these aims and in addition it was always accessible and attractively presented with a real flair for decorative woodcuts. Some of the early numbers focussed on particular ideas. Number 4, in October 1919, for example, was concerned with 'Some Modern French Poets', surveyed by F.S.Flint, with extracts from the poetry of Apollinaire, Cocteau, Claudel, Verhaeren and others; in August 1920, Flint updated this study with a commentary on 'Younger French Poets', including Tzara, Picabia, Soupault, Breton and Aragon, thus showing his awareness of the *avant garde*. The list of contributors to The Chapbook in the years 1919 to 1924 reads like a kind of roll call of the poets of three nations - England, France and the United States - and drama was not neglected. The June 1921 issue had a list of '101 Commendable Plays' and Ford's 'A House' and Act One of Mr. Bosphorus and the Muses appeared in March 1921 and May 1923 respectively.¹ In June 1922, The Chapbook was devoted to 'Three Questions and about 27 Answers' on the nature of poetry.² The point to register here is that Monro felt sufficiently confident to use The Chapbook as a forum for this kind of discussion.

Such a journal, despite its range, attractiveness and relative cheapness - one shilling - was not produced without difficulty. In July 1921 a six month break in production occurred and thereafter, The Chapbook appeared roughly every quarter. By June 1923, the editorial

¹ 'A House' was advertised as having decorations by the author, although the homely woodcuts were probably by Stella Bowen. The Chapbook also published a poem by Ford, 'Immortality: An Elegy on a Great Poet Dying Abroad' in July 1920.

² Part of Ford's answer has already been cited on pp.8 and 25 of Chapter 1.

complained of poor circulation figures, which needed to be at least 1500, instead of the 1000 it sold, to break even. "The average monthly deficit is almost precisely equivalent to the average monthly payment to contributors."¹ By 1924, The Chapbook had become an anthology, published in hardcovers, but if it was sinking, it was going down fighting. "The object of The Chapbook is to encourage new talent and to introduce to the public writers and artists of genuine originality...We do not know of twenty English or American periodicals that even profess these aims. Therefore we have a definite excuse for continuing our efforts."² Number 40, in 1925, was sadly the last issue of The Chapbook, though with an article by Leonard Woolf on obscurity in ultra modern literature, wood engravings by David Jones, drawings by Paul Nash and Wyndham Lewis and poetry by H.D., Cavafy, Sassoon and Cocteau, the range and quality was as high as ever. Not as highbrow (nor as dull) as The Criterion nor as *avant garde* as Tyrol, The Chapbook is one of the major achievements of English cultural journalism after the war and again was available and known to Ford as a possible model.

A number of completely new journals were started in the early twenties, some of which are relevant to Ford's second editorial venture. The first was the expensive and upmarket, though culturally conservative quarterly, The Golden Hind, which appeared in 1922. Volume one was folio in size, costing six shillings and contained superb lithographs by John Nash, and poetry by F.S.Flint, W.H.Davies and Laurence Houseman and a familiar sounding diatribe by Ford about over poetic poetry and "the highly refined imaginations of the more select classes."³ The high quality and cost of production could not be

¹ Chapbook, No.38, June 1923, 3.

² *Ibid.*, No.39, 1924, 5.

³ The Golden Hind, Vol.I, no.1, no date given, 16. Harvey gives the date as October, 1922.

sustained, however, and in its second year, it was reduced to quarto size, and by number 8 at the end of 1924, it announced that "owing to insufficient support, this magazine will no longer appear."

Sharply contrasted with this both in price and appearance was The Adelphi, a monthly, edited by Middleton Murry. Its editorial aims sound idealistic, even naive. "The Adelphi is not a business proposition, or a literary enterprise, or a nice little book in a pretty yellow cover," (though in fact it was all of these); "It is primarily and essentially an assertion of a faith that life is important."¹ This idealism seems to have appealed to the public, since the first issue, of 88 pages and priced at one shilling, sold out and was reprinted twice. The Adelphi had financial backing from Vivien Locke Ellis, and a business manager, S.S.Koteliansky (who translated for The Criterion and other journals) and it seems to have been efficiently run. Nevertheless, by April 1924, after less than twelve months, the editor announced that the price had gone up to 1s. 3d. and appealed for subscriptions. He refused to run it at a loss, but "The Adelphi will be considered to pay its way, so long as contributors receive something for their work, while the editor receives nothing either for his editing or his writing."² In fact, Murry continued to edit The Adelphi until September 1930 and the journal itself ran until 1955.

Part of its success lay in the warmth and friendliness with which the editor addressed his readers. They were encouraged to feel part of a shared venture by features such as 'Contributors' Club', which was a series of mini essays and reviews. The contents of this section in the first issue give an idea of what was involved; H.M.Tomlinson on

¹ The Adelphi, Vol.I, June 1923, 8.

² Ibid., April 1924, 722.

H.G.Wells, Arnold Bennett on Gustav Holst's 'Perfect Fool', Harold Laski on 'Big Business and Universities' and Murry himself on the irony of E.M. Forster. The Adelphi was, perhaps reassuringly for its readers, never *avant garde*, but always intelligent. Under Murry, it published a great deal of D.H.Lawrence and Katherine Mansfield, while other contributors included Edward Garnett, Edmund Blunden, Dorothy Richardson, Helen Wadell, John Galsworthy and C.E.M.Joad, with Tchekov, Gorki and Ahkmatova in translation. The Adelphi, in fact, is remarkably similar in flavour to The English Review under Ford, and while it is without the aggressive quirkiness of Ford's social and political statements in both his reviews, it shares their stated belief in literature.

One of the most prestigious journals contemporary with The Transatlantic Review was The Criterion, though it is difficult to disentangle its reputation from that of its editor, T.S.Eliot. Eliot, like Ford, had considerable experience of contributing to cultural journals, both as a poet and as an essayist and reviewer, and was anxious to edit his own review, feeling that the climate was right for such a venture. "I think the best thing now would be if there were several modest periodicals on the market, involving little outlay which could be left off or transformed at any time."¹ Plans for him to do editorial work for The New Age and for Dial had come to nothing, but when Lady Rothermere, wife of the newspaper magnate, agreed to fund a quarterly journal for three years, Eliot began, in the spring of 1922, to plan The Criterion. His correspondence for that year shows him actively seeking contributions from, for example, Valéry Larbaud, Hermann Hesse, John Rodker, F.S.Flint, André Gide, and Paul Valéry. He was not particularly anxious to recruit Ford. As he explained to Ezra Pound, "The difficulty, if I asked him, would be to get some of his really best work but not simply his egotistical meanderings about his own services to English

¹ T.S.Eliot to Middleton Murry, April 22, 1921, The Letters of T.S.Eliot Vol. I 1898-1922, ed. Valerie Eliot (London: 1988), p.447.

literature."¹

Eliot's correspondence shows that he was quite clear about what he wanted his review to achieve. He wanted "to get work by the best writers on the continent, as other reviews here publish very little by foreign authors."² He wanted "to raise the standard of thought and writing in this country by both international and historical comparison."³ And he wanted to "secure the best people of each generation and type." By this he meant that "the best writing of our time (which of course means a very small number of writers) will really appear to better advantage among the really respectable and serious writers of the older type than among their own third-rate and vulgar imitators."⁴ These views were expanded in an essay, 'The Function of a Literary Review', which he wrote at the end of The Criterion's first year. He rejected the idea of such a review as an outlet for "the chat of coteries," seeing instead, rather as Ford had done with The English Review, that his project would be a defence of literature against the attacks of the philistines. "It is the function of a literary review to maintain the autonomy and the disinterestedness of literature, and at the same time to exhibit the relations of literature - not to 'life' as something contrasted to literature - but to all the other activities, which, together with literature, are the components of life."⁵

Thus far there is little to separate Eliot and Ford in terms of their editorial principles; both believed in the importance of literature, both wanted to combine the best work of older

¹ T.S.Eliot to Ezra Pound, Oct. 22, 1922, Ibid., pp.585-6.

² T.S.Eliot to Valéry Larbaud, Mar. 12, 1922, Ibid., p.508.

³ T.S.Eliot to E.R.Curtius, July 21, 1922, Ibid., p.550.

⁴ T.S.Eliot to John Quinn, Sep. 21, 1922, Ibid., p.573.

⁵ Criterion, Vol.I, No.4, July 1923, 412.

writers with the most exciting new works and, particularly with The Transatlantic Review in mind, both wanted to provide a forum for foreign writers. Where Eliot differed markedly from Ford as an editor was in his capacity for planning and organisation. Admittedly, Eliot had no worries about funding during The Criterion's first years, and unlike Ford, he had no personal financial investment in his journal. He had, however, given considerable thought to the viability of a journalistic venture. "There are the questions (1) are there enough good contributors (2) are there enough possible subscribers (3) cost (4) whether I am competent and have time enough."¹ These were questions which Ford only addressed when some crisis forced him to consider them. Eliot kept tight financial control of The Criterion's budget, and was explicit about what its contributors could expect to be paid, £10 per 5000 words,² or fifteen shillings per 1000 words for translation.³ Other correspondence with The Criterion's publisher, Richard Cobden-Sanderson, in the autumn of 1922, reveals a concern for details of publicity, cost, layout and length. Eliot's freedom from financial worries, his capacity for organisation and the fact that he was editing a quarterly rather than a monthly, enabled him to develop The Criterion carefully and rationally along personally chosen lines, to maintain a consistent quality of contribution and to use the journal to express his clearly held convictions about the nature and function of a literary review. When Ford tried to do the same with both his reviews, they foundered.

The concerns of The Criterion were exclusively cultural and almost entirely literary; unlike many of its contemporaries, it was very little concerned with the visual arts or music. It

¹ T.S.Eliot to Mary Hutchinson, Sept.1, 1921, Letters, Vol.I, p.467.

² T.S.Eliot to Valéry Larbaud, Mar.12,1922, Ibid., p.508.

³ T.S.Eliot to F.S.Flint, July 13,1922, Ibid., p. 542.

did publish a very wide range of literary material. The first issue included 'The Waste Land', Valéry Larbaud on 'The Ulysses of James Joyce', a short story by May Sinclair, Dostoevsky's plan of a novel 'The Life of a Great Sinner' translated by S.S.Koteliansky, and T.Sturge Moore on 'The Story of Tristram and Isolde in Modern Poetry'. In this selection Eliot showed his grasp both of a European literary tradition and of contemporary European writing. Every number in the first volume contained translations from and commentaries on European writing, impressive short stories by Pirandello and Virginia Woolf, and important critical essays - Pound on 'Criticism in General' in number 2, Herbert Read on 'Metaphysical Poetry' in number 3 and, in October 1923, in the first number of the second volume, Eliot's own essay, 'The Function of Criticism'. The Criterion went on to publish many of Eliot's essays and thus became an important outlet for his literary criticism. Other contributions during the first two years included George Saintsbury on 'Dullness in Literature' in October 1922, Ford's rambling anecdotal article on Provence in October 1923, which fulfilled Eliot's misgivings about him as a contributor, Pound on George Antheil, the young American musician, in April 1924, a long short story by Hugh Walpole, 'The Old Ladies' in April and July 1924, Virginia Woolf on 'Character in Fiction' and Harold Monro on Wordsworth in July 1924, translations from Proust, Cavafy, and Tolstoy's letters, and reviews by Herbert Read, F.S.Flint, Frederic Manning and Conrad Aiken. From April 1923 it also provided a survey of foreign reviews, which offers an insight into the kind of cultural journal esteemed by Eliot. The first list, for example, includes La Nouvelle Revue Française, Mercure de France, La Revue Musicale, Les Marges, La Revue de l'Amerique Latin, Les Cahiers Idéalistes, La Vie des Lettres, Die Neue Rundschau, Der Neue Merker, Dial, Secession and Rhythmus. Significantly, at no point was The Transatlantic Review included in this survey, and Eliot declined to contribute anything other than a letter in the opening number, to Ford's journal.

In its early years, The Criterion, was highbrow, progressive without being wildly experimental, conventional in its format and serious in intent. Its concern with literature from other cultures, both European and American, is at least as great as that shown in The Transatlantic Review, though the balance is rather different. Ford's journal avowedly addressed this internationality of culture, but was not breaking new ground in doing so, since other journals such as The Criterion and The Anglo French Review had already done this. The existence of The Criterion, which was for sale in France and the United States, as well as England, for twelve months before The Transatlantic Review appeared, may well have rendered Ford's new venture that much more vulnerable. While such a view is purely speculative, potential subscribers may well have asked themselves whether they needed yet another cultural journal, and since The Criterion cost three shillings and sixpence every quarter compared with The Transatlantic Review at two shillings a month, it may have seemed better value for money.

American Journals.

American cultural journals which preceded or were contemporary with The Transatlantic Review are important for two reasons. The first is that because The Transatlantic Review so explicitly addressed American culture and an American readership and because it published so much work by American writers, it is helpful to see what kind of American cultural journals these writers and readers were used to. The other is that some of these journals were important in setting an agenda for cultural journalism, particularly in establishing a sense of an international community of letters, and were able to use the increasing number of Americans in Europe to establish contact with some of the most interesting writers of the day.

The best known of these journals were established several years before Ford started The Transatlantic Review; the earliest, Poetry, for example, well known to students of Modernism, first appeared in Chicago in October 1912. Its editor, Harriet Monroe, described it in this first number as "a modest effort to give poetry her own place, her own voice."¹ Like Ford, Monroe was appalled at the general indifference to literature, and especially to poetry. "The vast English speaking world says to its poets: 'Silence' ... As a modest attempt to change conditions absolutely destructive to the most necessary and universal of the arts, it is proposed to publish a small monthly magazine of verse, which shall give the poets the chance to be heard."² Publishing contemporary poetry and articles on and reviews of poetry, Monroe's journal was at its most innovative in its early years, and particularly in the first years of the war, when Pound was Poetry's Foreign Correspondent.³ It was Pound's influence which ensured that in June 1914, Poetry published Ford's 'On Heaven' while Pound reviewed Ford's Collected Poems in 'Mr. Hueffer and the Prose Tradition in Verse', and twelve months later, in June 1915, Eliot's 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock' appeared. By 1924, Poetry had become dull and earnest; Volume 23, from October 1923 to March 1924, contained much very mediocre poetry, though there were reviews of the work of Mina Loy, William Carlos Williams, D.H. Lawrence and Wallace Stevens.

Although Poetry was never a commercial proposition, it got off to a reasonable start because Monroe first secured its income by getting 100 business men to provide \$50 a year for five years. Despite this, Poetry was in financial difficulties by 1913, and in 1915, the

¹ Poetry, Vol. I, No. 1, Oct. 1912, 27.

² Publicity circular, April 1912, cited in Ella Williams, Harriet Monroe and the Poetry Renaissance: The First Ten Years of Poetry, 1912-1922 (Illinois: 1977), p.15.

³ He transferred his energies first to The Little Review in 1917, and then to Dial in 1919.

payment of \$10 a page for contributors was cut to \$8. The price went up from \$1.50 to \$2 in 1917, and to \$3 in 1920, when subscriptions were down by a third. For every year for which figures are available, except the first, expenditure exceeded income¹ and the editor's difficulties were compounded by quarrels with Pound over prizes for the best contributions, by overwork, by the dearth of English poetry as the Great War took its toll, and by competition from other journals such as The Little Review. Monroe was also very cautious in her attitude to the censors, refusing to publish Pound's 'Cabaret Dancers', and removing swearwords from other contributions.² Nevertheless, Poetry, unlike The Transatlantic Review, kept going - (it still does) - and during the first ten years of its existence was very impressive, publishing more new poetry than any other journal except The Dial.

In March 1914, eighteen months after Poetry first appeared, Margaret Anderson, also in Chicago, brought out the first number of The Little Review. It was, as she claimed on the back cover of the June/July issue of 1916, "a magazine that believes in Life for Art's Sake, in the Individual rather than Incomplete People, in an age of Imagination rather than of reasonableness ... a magazine written for Intelligent People whose policy is a Will to Splendour of Life." The capital letters suggest something of Anderson's crusading intensity as well as her naivete. The early issues of The Little Review dealt with Nietzsche, feminism and the importance of the arts, and published a great deal of poetry, especially the Imagists and the work of H.D., but The Little Review really took off at the end of 1916. Anderson had been joined by Jane Heap as co-editor, and moved from Chicago to New York. "I feel," wrote Anderson, "as though we have an entirely new lease on life and

¹ Harriet Monroe and the Poetry Renaissance, p.295.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 182 and 190.

are just starting with what we have to say."¹ The years which followed were glorious and exciting.

Pound became London editor in 1917, because he wanted "a place where I and T.S.Eliot can appear once a month and where Joyce can appear when he likes, and where Wyndham Lewis can appear if he comes back from the war."² Pound undoubtedly bullied Anderson, but his behaviour paid dividends for the review. He was able to persuade John Quinn, a wealthy American lawyer and art collector, to provide it with \$400 and to influence others to do the same. He also brought in contributions, from Jean de Bosschere, W.B.Yeats, Lady Gregory, T.S.Eliot, Wyndham Lewis, May Sinclair, Ford himself³ and pre-eminently, James Joyce's Ulysses which was serialised from March 1918. The Little Review became "The Magazine that is Read by Those who Write the Others,"⁴ and Pound compared its achievement with "what the English Review did during its first year and a half: that is to maintain the rights and position of literature."⁵

In 1918, The Little Review began devoting issues to particular topics or writers; for, example, June 1918 was 'An American Number', February/March 1918 'A Remy de Gourmont Number' and June 1921 'A Brancusi Number'. It became increasingly international, multicultural and democratic with regular contributions from French writers including Jules Romains, Louis Aragon, Francis Picabia and Philippe Soupault,

¹ The Little Review, Nov. 1916, 21.

² Ezra Pound to Margaret Anderson, Jan. 20, 1917, Pound/The Little Review: The Letters of Ezra Pound to Margaret Anderson: The Little Review Correspondence, ed. Thomas L. Scott, Melvin J. Friedman (London: 1989), p.6.

³ Ford's 'Women and Men', appeared in The Little Review between January and May, 1918.

⁴ The Little Review, Dec. 1917, Front cover.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 54.

illustrations by Max Weber, Brzeska, Stanislaw Szukalszki and Brancusi, and a 'Reader Critic' section. In the autumn of 1921, The Little Review became a quarterly with a much more experimental European and visual arts emphasis. The Spring issue of 1923, when both Anderson and Heap were in Paris, was an exiles number and included work by Hemingway, Gertrude Stein, Mina Loy, e.e.cummings, Robert McAlmon, Ferdinand Leger, Joan Miro and the score of George Antheil's 'Airplane Sonata' for piano. The Autumn/Winter 1923-4 issue which came out as Ford was working towards the launch of The Transatlantic Review, was, if anything, even more impressive, with work by Tzara, Soupault, Leger, Mina Loy, Man Ray, Juan Gris and Hans Arp; the volume and quality of the art work and the variety of typefaces used, make Ford's journal seem traditional and old-fashioned. Many of his contributors had already appeared in The Little Review, so that his venture seemed unoriginal by comparison; he was following where The Little Review had already lead.

Ford admired The Little Review and praised Margaret Anderson for supplying "in a world where nothing good is sure of a place anywhere ... a certain, dead sure place for really good, unusual writing."¹ Ford was right; The Little Review was remarkable for its energy, its enthusiasm, its flair and its longevity, and is all the more remarkable considering the shoe string budget on which it was run, and the chaos and uncertainty which surrounded much of its production. Margaret Anderson, even more than Ford, was hopeless with money. "I can't earn my own living. I could never make anything turn into money."² She had learned some of the practical skills of editing and publishing, such as proof reading and page make up from a brief period spent working on The Dial before she began her

¹ The Little Review, May 1929, 91. This was the last issue.

² Margaret Anderson, My Thirty Years War: An Autobiography (London: 1930), p.4.

own review, but money was simply something she expected to turn up. "I knew that someone would give me money... Someone would have to. Of course, someone did."¹ The size and the price of The Little Review fluctuated wildly over the years, according to what could be afforded, and there were regular pleas for subscriptions, advertisers and benefactors. Yet there was rarely any compromise over quality; in September 1916, it appeared with blank pages rather than offer work which Anderson and Heap considered inferior.

So it is pertinent to ask why The Little Review under Anderson kept going for so long, offering work of such a consistently high quality, when Ford survived for only twelve months as editor for both his reviews. Part of the answer lies in the fact that for Anderson, editing was her whole life. "I was born to be an editor ... I'm not a writer, I will never be one. I'm merely an inspiration to writers - I tell them what they should be."² Ford was a creative writer for whom editing was a secondary activity, and while he shared Anderson's missionary zeal about the primacy of the arts and her desire to support new writers, editing was not his only reason for existence. Anderson may have been better served by her helpers; despite disagreements, Jane Heap and Ezra Pound were far more use to her than Basil Bunting and Ernest Hemingway were to Ford. And, of course, the circumstances out of which the two reviews arose were different. The Little Review in 1914 had an almost clear field, whereas The Transatlantic Review in 1924 was entering a crowded market.

In the wake of Poetry and The Little Review, other American reviews were established or existing reviews were reorganised on more contemporary lines. One of the latter, published

¹ Ibid., p.36.

² Ibid., pp. 58-9.

in Scranton, Pennsylvania, was The Dial, originally founded in 1880, which reappeared in a new format in 1920 and carried the first American printing of 'The Waste Land' in November 1922. It was always serious, well informed and interdisciplinary; its artwork, often reproduced in colour, was excellent. In 1924, when its editor was Scofield Thayer, artists whose work appeared in The Dial included Chagall, Munch, Picasso, Matisse, Derain, Duncan Grant and Eric Gill. Its writers in the same year included Glenway Westcott, e.e.cummings, W.C.Williams, Thomas Mann - the serialisation of Death in Venice began in March - W.B.Yeats, E.M.Forster, Clive Bell, Virginia Woolf and Roger Fry. The reviewing was consistently good, with Middleton Murry, Marianne Moore, Malcolm Cowley, Edmund Wilson and Conrad Aiken providing many of the reviews. Despite its staid appearance, in sombre rust coloured covers and black lettering, The Dial as a cultural journal was at least as impressive as The Transatlantic Review and was rather more consistent in quality; it is another example of a journal which was engaging effectively with contemporary cultural issues *before* Ford began to edit The Transatlantic Review. It was readily available in Paris, since it was stocked in Sylvia Beach's bookshop.

Other journals were started to promote American writing in Europe; Contact, for example, which appeared for five issues only between December 1920 and June 1923, was edited by Robert McAlmon and William Carlos Williams. It was little more than a series of jottings by the editors, together with poems by them and by Mina Loy, Kay Boyle, Glenway Westcott and Wallace Gould. It also printed, in the fourth undated issue, an article by Pound, 'Douglas's Credit Power and Democracy'. It was a thin production in every sense of the word, and its relevance here lies in its stridently pro-American stance, - "the artist might profit largely by an American experience"¹ - which presages the

¹ Contact, No. 4, no date, 18.

increasing American bias assumed by The Transatlantic Review.

Rather more prestigious, though even more short lived, was Broom, edited by Harold Loeb and Alfred Kreymborg, and subtitled 'An American Magazine of the Arts published by Americans in Italy'. It ran to about 100 pages and each of the eleven issues had different and very striking cover designs by artists such as Fernand Leger, Juan Gris and Kawashima, with other art work by Man Ray, Derain, Picasso, Lipchitz, Matisse, Dufy, Wanda Gag and Cocteau. Broom's aim was to introduce "to the public not only American Writers and Artists, previously unknown, but ... also ... translations of the work of innovators, important to European literature, who have not hitherto found a hearing in the United States."¹ This work included Gertrude Stein's 'If You Had Three Husbands', a play, Proteus, by Paul Claudel, an unpublished chapter from Dostoevsky's Possessed, the first act of Pirandello's Six Characters in Search of an Author which had just received its first performance in London, and poetry by Edward Storer, Edwin Muir, Yvor Winters, Wallace Stevens, Harold Monroe, John Gould Fletcher, e.e.cummings and Marianne Moore.

Broom is interesting because its editorial policy has a great deal in common with that of The Transatlantic Review, in that it aimed to draw contributions from Great Britain, Europe and America and to appeal to subscribers in two continents. "Broom is selecting from Continental Literature of the present time, the writings of exceptional quality most adaptable for translation into English. These will appear side by side with the contemporary effort in Great Britain and America ... BROOM is a sort of clearing house where the artists of the present time will be brought into closer contact."² Apart from the

¹ Broom, Feb. 1922, inside back cover.

² Ibid., Nov. 1921, Manifesto, inside front cover.

fact that Ford didn't think that translations from the French were necessary,¹ the concept of the internationality of letters is remarkably similar to that held by Ford. Indeed, in many ways, Broom, even more than Tyro and The Criterion, can be seen as the natural precursor to The Transatlantic Review; it was at least as original, showed a healthy disrespect for authority and its coverage of the visual arts and the quality of its art reproductions was far higher. It isn't clear why Broom failed to survive for longer than twelve months, though one of its editors, Kreymborg, resigned through ill health in March 1922, and in October that year, there was an announcement that the journal was moving to Berlin where there were better technical facilities; no more issues materialised. It is uncertain whether Ford was acquainted with it, since Broom ceased publication in the month before he arrived in Paris, though he knew several of its contributors, some of whom later provided work for his own journal.

French Cultural Journals

Because The Transatlantic Review was edited and published in Paris and included substantial chunks of writing in French, it is worth looking at the French cultural journals against which Ford's journal was, to an extent, competing. As in England, some of these were long established, such as Mercure de France founded in 1890, and La Revue de Paris, founded in 1893. Both were solid, old-fashioned fortnightly reviews, ranging widely over politics, history, science and philosophy as well as literature. Two other long running journals were more exclusively devoted to cultural concerns. Les Marges, founded in 1903, and subtitled 'Gazette de Littérature et d'Art', was frequently cited in lists of French cultural reviews; Eliot, for example, included it in his lists in The Criterion. The other and

¹ "If any gentleman cannot read enough of French to appreciate the relatively[sic] prose with which we present him he had better - oh, go and learn it!" Transatlantic Review, Apr. 1924, 201.

better known, was La Nouvelle Revue Française, a 'Revue Mensuelle de Littérature et de Critique', founded in 1909. Publication ceased during the war, and it restarted under Jacques Rivière in 1919. A measure of the quality of the revised review can be seen from some of the contributions of the first six months; these included Gide's La Symphonie Pastorale, fragments of Proust's work in progress, a new play, Le Père Humilié, by Claudel, poems by Paul Valéry, together with work by younger writers including Giradoux, Romain, and Montherlant. Its contributors in the first six months of 1924 included André Gide, Valéry Larbaud, François Mauriac, André Maurois, Jules Romain and Jacques Rivière, none of whom contributed to The Transatlantic Review. La Nouvelle Revue Française was primarily a critical review; at least half of each issue was devoted to discussion of literary ideas and the book reviewing was impressive and up to date, though one notable omission, which The Transatlantic Review tried to correct, was any discussion of American literature. It did, however, review other foreign literature translated from English, Russian and German. In December 1924, it published a very comprehensive Conrad issue, which included Heart of Darkness in French, and appreciations by other writers, including Gide and Galsworthy, but not one by Ford. Each issue ended with a look at other reviews, and although this included some of the newer and smaller journals such as Le Disque Vert and Commerce, The Transatlantic Review was never mentioned; it is almost as if Ford were invisible. In 1924, La Nouvelle Revue Française was very impressive, far more consistent than Ford's review, and at least as thoughtful, intelligent and aware of new literary developments.

The contrast between these highbrow and sometimes rather staid journals, and the productions put out by the Dadaists could hardly be more striking. The first one, a sheet of foolscap paper folded in four and called 'The ridgefield Gazook', appeared in March 31, 1915. Its anarchic nature can be judged from its announcement that it was to be "published

unnecessarily whenever the spirits move us. Subscriptions free to whomever we please. Contributions received in liquid form only." The 'editor', (if such a formal title is not inappropriate) was Man Ray who added a sketch of copulating flies which he called 'The Cosmic Urge'. Other productions followed at irregular intervals, aimed at different Dadaist groups, 'Americano', 'Francese' and 'Germanico'. In the Americano edition for April 1921, the cover was greased brown paper with 'dada new york' printed upside down all over the front, and a weird poem by Elsa Baroness von Freytag Loringhoven, also upside down, on the back. A letter from Tzara proclaimed "There is nothing more incomprehensible than Dada. Nothing more indefinable." The first Dada Francese asked "Qu'est-ce que Dada?" and replied "Dada est irrité de ceux qui écrivent 'L'Art', 'la Beauté', 'la Verité' avec des majuscules."¹ The publication for May 21, 1920 was a tiny volume like a book of raffle tickets, crammed with contributions from Eluard, Picabia, Tzara, Soupault, Breton, Aragon and Ribement Dessaignes, while that for 1922, planned to coincide with the Paris Congress, was simply a large sheet of paper folded in four, printed with deliberate nonsense on all sides, in all directions and in a whole range of types. The Dada productions in a sense take up where Blast left off, but deliberately avoid Blast's coherence. They are well outside the mainstream of cultural journals from any nation and their influence in terms of editorial ideas is minimal, with the possible exception of later editions of Littérature. But the Dada offerings, in addition to being entertaining in their own right, are useful as a yard stick for measuring how conservative or *avant garde* other publications were.

The idea of Littérature was first conceived in the winter of 1917 by André Breton and Phillipe Soupault. They obtained "la collaboration des écrivains qu'à cette époque nous

¹ Dada Francese, no date, No.1, 1.

admire et qui ne pouvaient pas encore publier ... leur poèmes. Drole Époque. Époque incertain et équivoque"¹ and made a brilliant start. It was only a small journal of about 24 pages, but published both the work of established writers such as Gide, Valéry, Apollinaire and Romain, but also the work of much younger writers, including Aragon, Tzara, Breton, Soupault, Reverdy and Eluard. The Dada influence can be seen not only in the names of many of the contributors, but in the readiness to challenge the prevailing orthodoxies. In November 1919, for example, contributors and readers were asked on the front page, "Pourquoi Écrivez-Vous?". The replies poured in and were printed in subsequent months. Valéry's was "Par faiblesse", Cendrars's "Parce que" and Max Jacob's "Pour mieux écrire."² Dujardin, editor of Les Cahiers Idéalistes, replied that it was like asking "Pourquoi un pommier produit-il des pommes?" while Picabia retorted "Je ne le sais vraiment pas et j'espère ne jamais le savoir."³ In March 1921, Littérature published an amusing league table of famous names in cultural history going back to the Greeks, in which regular contributors were asked to rate them on a scale which went from minus 25 - "la plus grande aversion" - to plus 20; zero equalled "l'indifférence absolue." Anatole France scored -18.00, John Stuart Mill -17.45, Flaubert -5.00, Christ -2.90, Shakespeare + 9.18, Swift +11.09 and the unknown soldier +15.63. Not surprisingly, Tzara, Aragon, Soupault and Breton were at the top of the list.⁴

After a short break, a new series of Littérature began in March 1922. There were changes in format, each issue had a different cover, often a new typeface and it began to look more

¹ Littérature, Vol.I, No1, Mar. 1919, vi.

² Ibid., No.10, Dec. 1919, pp.26, 24 and 23 respectively.

³ Ibid., No. 12, Feb.1920, pp.21 and 26.

⁴ Ibid., No.18, Mar.1921, 1-7.

'experimental'. The double number for October 1923, for example, had a full page spread of writers' names in a variety of typefaces and sizes. Publication became more irregular and fragmentary, but the sense of excitement was sustained until the last issue in June 1924, which was entitled 'Numéro démoralisant'; this issue also contained the Man Ray photograph of a naked woman's back as a cello. Littérature was probably the most exciting cultural journal to be published in Paris in the early twenties. It was genuinely experimental, defiant of establishment procedures, but less anarchic than Dada. Given Ford's contacts in Paris - Soupault was the Paris correspondent of The Transatlantic Review for a time - he must have known it, but chose not to follow its path. Any comparison between the two journals makes The Transatlantic Review seem formal and backward looking.

As in England, there was a proliferation of new journals in the post war years trying to engage with contemporary cultural ferment, of which Dada and Littérature are the most original examples. There were others, such as Action, and Le Disque Vert, which were very short lived and therefore with a message for Ford if he chose to notice it. Even less than The English Review, The Transatlantic Review did not arise out of some kind of desert of cultural journalism, such as Ford and Bennett had complained of in 1908. Ford had an even wider range of models (and indeed warnings) available for his second editorial venture than for his first and had himself contributed to many of them. He was familiar with both conservative and innovative ventures, with the commercially successful and the failures, and with journals from each of the three countries he hoped to target, though he may have been more out of touch than he was when he was editing The English Review; Harvey lists only five contributions to other cultural journals in 1922 and 1923.¹

¹ Harvey, pp. 223- 227.

The Transatlantic Review is largely a follower rather than a setter of trends and standards in cultural journalism. Additionally, it does not always follow the trends successfully; it is neither as scholarly as La Nouvelle Revue Française or The Criterion, as inventive as Littérature or The Little Review and the quality of its illustrations is poor when compared to those in Art and Letters or The Dial. Part of the reason for The Transatlantic Review not being a trend setter is simply because so much new ground had already been broken by some of the journals surveyed in this chapter. Ford had neither the time nor the energy to devote to making his new review a trail blazer; his confidence in himself as a creative writer was returning and there was Parade's End to write as well as a review to edit. It was more as if producing a literary review was the appropriate thing to do in Paris in 1924. As Stella Bowen observed, "Naturally the idea of editing a new review in Paris which was then crammed with young writers from all over the world, was just jam for Ford."¹ Ford certainly used The Transatlantic Review to present some of these writers, but perhaps the most surprising thing about it is how *unmodern* it was, how like The English Review, and how unlike so many contemporary cultural journals.

¹ Drawn From Life, p.114.

Chapter 10 The Career and Failure of The Transatlantic Review

Career

The English Review arose out of what Ford and some of his friends perceived to be a crisis in English culture and a gap in English cultural journalism. The circumstances which produced The Transatlantic Review were very different. The preceding chapter has charted the growth in cultural journalism since Ford left The English Review and he could hardly claim that Paris in the early twenties was in cultural crisis. It was, rather, a city in cultural ferment; it "gyrated, seethed, clamoured, roared with the Arts."¹ Part of this ferment was a plethora of journalistic ventures, and when Ford arrived in Paris in October 1922, preceded by his reputation as editor of The English Review, it was more or less inevitable that sooner or later, he would become involved with another cultural journal.

As often with Ford's affairs, the actual origins of the review are not entirely clear. Ford himself claimed that it "arose almost accidentally." He had been thinking that

it would be a good thing if someone would start a centre for the more modern and youthful of the art movements, with which, in 1923, the city, like an immense seething cauldron, bubbled and overflowed. I hadn't thought the task was meant for me. But a dozen times, I was stopped on the Boulevards and told that what was needed was another English Review.²

This statement ignores the existence of reviews such as Littérature and The Little Review, which were being produced in Paris to precisely the agenda outlined by Ford, but he was pleased by the flattery awarded to his editorial reputation. The real impetus came from some apparently ready made financial backing. Ford's brother, Oliver, a writer and

¹ It Was The Nightingale, p.259.

² Ibid., p.248.

journalist, was also living in Paris, and at a casual meeting with Ford, told him that "some Paris friends of his wanted me to edit a review for them ... He mentioned names which were dazzling in the Paris of that day and sums the disposal of which would have made the durability of any journal absolutely certain."¹ Such an offer was irresistible, though Ford's experiences with financial backers for The English Review should have told him that unlimited finance did not come without strings attached. However, the day after Oliver presented his proposal, Ford was taken to an office in the Quartier de l'Étoile, to meet the review backer, who was said to be "the principal winning owner of the French turf that year"² and who apparently guaranteed secure money and absolute editorial control. This sounds too good to be true and no names of the supposed backers have ever emerged. They were not entirely a figment of Ford's imagination, however; a letter to Edgar Jepson, dated, October 14, 1923, was written on notepaper on which the heading Paris Review had been crossed out and Transatlantic put in its place.³ So Ford may have been approached about the possibility of him editing a review in Paris, but it seems likely that he fictionalised this as he did the account of Wells' involvement in the planning stages of The English Review. What does seem certain is that Ford was sufficiently convinced of support to start work.

To start a new review Ford needed several things. The first was finance, which he thought was agreed. The second was publicity and advertising revenue for which Miss Marjorie Reid was engaged, and her efficiency became "the backbone of the concern."⁴ The third

¹ Ibid., p.255.

² Ibid., p.262.

³ Ludwig, p.153.

⁴ Drawn from Life, p.117.

was a place to produce it, and William Bird provided Ford with office space in a gallery at the back of his Three Mountains Press on the Quai d'Anjou, which "was sufficiently large as to floor space, but it was not much more than five feet high, and Miss Reid and I had permanently contused skulls."¹ Finally a review needed contributors. William Bird wrote to Hemingway in early September 1923, giving him news of the review, adding that "McAlmon is going to contribute and so is everyone else."² Ford wrote to A.E.Coppard on September 28, 1923, asking for a short story,³ and to his daughter Katharine in Ireland, suggesting that she might like to provide a Dublin letter.⁴ By October the letters of Ford, Pound, Joyce, Hemingway and others testify that Ford was indeed working hard on a new review. Joyce was initially reluctant to contribute anything from Finnegans Wake to the new venture after his experiences with the fragmented publication of Ulysses in The Little Review, so Ford's success here was an editorial coup.⁵

Problems with Ford's unnamed backers arose very quickly, as they tried to exert an influence on editorial policy. James Joyce reported to Harriet Weaver that Ford had been offered the editorship of a new Paris review "by a financial group on condition that nothing of mine was printed in it."⁶ It isn't clear exactly why and when Ford and his backers parted company, though Ford's total refusal to submit to censorship and his determination to publish something by Joyce, were partly responsible. Stella Bowen

¹ It Was The Nightingale. p.298.

² Cited in Michael Reynolds, Hemingway: The Paris Years (London: 1989), p. 153.

³ Ludwig, p.152.

⁴ Ford to Katharine Hueffer, Nov. 23, 1923, cited in Poli, p.35. She recommended Geoffrey Coulter.

⁵ Richard Ellman, James Joyce (New York: 1959 rev. Oxford: 1983), p.559.

⁶ James Joyce to Harriet Weaver, Oct. 9, 1923, The Letters of James Joyce, Vol.1, ed. Stuart Gilbert (London: 1957), p.204.

maintained that Ford was "misled as to the conditions that were actually being offered - maybe there had been some wishful thinking involved." By the time Ford had discovered that his backers wanted more control over contents than he was prepared to allow, and that their "proposition was quite unsubstantial", it was too late to withdraw. "The word had gone round that a new literary review was afoot ... and it would have been hard to announce that there would be no review after all."¹

Some alternative backing was quickly available. John Quinn, the American lawyer and art collector, who had provided substantial backing for Poetry and The Little Review and who was in regular contact with Pound and Joyce, was in Paris at the point where the original financial support was no longer available. Ford, unusually, was also in funds, having received £400 from the sale of a cottage in England. The meeting of Pound, Joyce, Quinn and Ford, probably in October 1923, and recorded in several photographs, marks the real start of The Transatlantic Review. Ford was convinced that Quinn's money and "his extraordinary powers of persuasion" would guarantee the review's success, though Quinn stipulated that Ford "was to find 51% of the capital and should hold 51% of the shares."² A more reliable, though more ominous omen of the review's chances of success, came from Ezra Pound, who was very active in promoting it. In an undated letter to his father, he advised him, "Don't for Gawd's sake put any money into the Transatlantic Review"³

In retrospect, Ford himself admitted to misgivings about the new financial arrangements. "What frightened me most was the thought of having to manage the business affairs of the

¹ Drawn from Life, pp.114-5.

² It Was The Nightingale, p.297.

³ Cited in Humphrey Carpenter, A Serious Character: A Life of Ezra Pound (London: 1988), p.429.

Review." He was persuaded to accept Quinn's money and invest some of his own, and later, Stella Bowen's money, partly because he "was convinced at that juncture some such review was a necessity",¹ but also because the signs seemed propitious. Production costs in Paris were cheap and there seemed to be no shortage of contributors, helpers and wellwishers; The Transatlantic Review "started with the good wishes of everybody."² And, as Sisley Huddleston said, "Ford knew what he was in for. He was not ignorant of the difficulties that lie in wait."³

What lay in wait for Ford was a great deal of fun and chaos. As with The English Review, the fun was mostly at the start. "The early days of the Transatlantic Review, before it became apparent that by no conceivable chance could it be made to pay, were great fun."⁴ Ford "really enjoyed himself superbly. He survived all the troubles and set backs that ordinarily would have bowled him over, with an amazing buoyancy, so deep was his pleasure in the enterprise."⁵ Ford's own account confirms Stella's, referring to "the excitement when somebody bought a copy... my emotions when I actually received seven francs fifty for a wad of paper that existed because of the labours of Miss Reid and myself."⁶ Again, as with The English Review, there was the hectic social whirl. "As soon as the first number was out the social life began. It came like an avalanche ... You never saw such teas as mine were at first. They would begin at nine in the morning and last for

¹ It Was The Nightingale, p.296.

² Back to Montparnasse, p.123.

³ *Ibid.*, p.124

⁴ Drawn From Life, p.116.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.117.

⁶ It Was The Nightingale, p.298.

twelve hours."¹ The teas were so popular that Ford was forced to rent a small dance hall to cope with the invasion.

Although the review had a big impact on Ford's social life, it was not generally critically acclaimed. When The English Review was launched, the press was full of its praises, but The Transatlantic Review slipped almost unnoticed onto the critical scene. This was partly due to its tripartite distribution system, which meant that its focus was less sharp than it might have been and hence, its impact in each of the three countries where it was published was lessened. It was also due to the fact that the birth of a new cultural journal was no longer a major event; they appeared, and disappeared, at an ever increasing rate. There *were* some good notices. The Paris edition of The Chicago Tribune, for example, which regularly placed advertisements in The Transatlantic Review, published a photograph of Ford, Pound, Joyce and Quinn on February 17, 1924, referring to them as "the big intellectual four who control the destinies of the new Transatlantic Review." On August 10 of that year, it praised the August number, which had been edited by Hemingway. There were mildly warm references in a number of London journals. The Saturday Review for February 23, for example, praised the Conrad/Ford collaboration for The Nature of a Crime and felt that the Chroniques section made good reading. The most glowing English notices came from The Spectator, which may have owed something to the fact that several contributors to the review, including A.W.Ellis, Anthony Bertram and A.E.Coppard, also worked for or contributed to The Spectator.

The comments which might have mattered most were the ones which were missing, perhaps the most noticeable silence being that of The Criterion, which carried surveys of

¹ Ibid., p.305.

cultural journals but signally ignored Ford's new review. Eliot was not a Ford admirer, and a long letter to him which appeared in the first number of The Transatlantic Review, supporting the new venture and endorsing its policy of internationalism, was as far as Eliot was prepared to go. The leading French cultural journals hardly gave it a mention and of Ford's many friends and acquaintances who flocked to his teas and dances, very few gave the review any publicity apart from the purely social. As Ford sardonically pointed out, if all those mid-Westeners who had clamoured to get in, "had bought a copy of the review, we should have made a fortune. Not one did."¹ Even Pound's letter to Ford, which praised the April number, and which Ford printed in the June issue, was not unstinting in its admiration, and Pound's offer to "come back and manage you at close range before you bring out any more numbers" can hardly have inspired either editor or readers with confidence.²

It was obvious after the first four issues that the review was in serious financial difficulties. Ford tried to raise money for it through a share issue and donations from friends, and threatened, in a letter to Pound dated May 8, 1924, to cease publication.³ Finally, he went to the States to try to sort out the difficulties with American distribution and payment, and to see whether John Quinn could help, both in dealings with Thomas Selzter, the American publisher of the review, and with further finance. Quinn was terminally ill with cancer and was able to see Ford only once; he was far too ill to take any action on Ford's behalf. His death was reported in the September issue and had a considerable impact. "It became necessary completely to reorganize the business side of the review and the labour falling

¹ Ibid., p.306.

² Transatlantic Review, June 1924, 480.

³ Cited in Poli, p.96.

entirely on the Paris editorial staff the actual editing fell perforce into abeyance."¹ Ford returned empty handed to Paris in early July to face the editorial difficulties created by Hemingway and seemingly determined to close the review. He wrote to Pound; "I am calling a meeting of this company for the 17th at Bird's office to wind up the review and should be glad if you would attend this as a full meeting of directors is necessary."² There is no record of this meeting taking place, though temporary financial backing was obtained from a young American, Krebs Friend and his wealthy and somewhat older wife; Friend was suffering from depression and it was hoped that the review would give him a new interest in life. Hemingway wrote to Gertrude Stein and Alice Toklas on August 9; "Well, the news is that the transatlantic is going on. I have a friend in town ... I got to guarantee Ford \$200 a month for six months ... with the first check written out and the others the first of each month."³ This sounded promising, but as Marjorie Reid pointed out in a letter to Poli, "Friend and his wife were ready to put the Transatlantic Review Company on a sound financial basis, but not wholly as a philanthropy ... I think they found the organisation of the company as nebulous as your research indicates and Friend's chance of receiving dividends from his venture, either in money or prestige, almost equally so."⁴ Despite Krebs Friend being elected president of the review company on August 15, organisational and financial difficulties continued to plague the review; its business affairs were wound up in a half hour meeting in Gertrude Stein's flat at the end of November,⁵

¹ Transatlantic Review, Sept. 1924, 297.

² Ford to Pound, July 14, 1942, 'Pound/Ford: Addenda and Corrections' ed. Brita Lindberg-Seyersted and Archie Henderson, Paideuma, Vol.14, Spring 1985, No.1, 123.

³ Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters 1917-1961, ed.Carlos Baker (London: 1981), p.120.

⁴ Marjorie Reid to Bernard Poli, April 15, 1964, Poli, p.115.

⁵ Poli, pp.125-126.

though even then, Ford was still trying to obtain backing from another American publisher.¹ The December issue was the last.

Perhaps the surprising thing is not that The Transatlantic Review only survived for a year, but that it lasted even as long as that. Hemingway believed that Ford wanted to use the death of Quinn as an excuse to close the review earlier,² but it is more likely that Ford kept the review going until December to enable him to finish his own tribute to Conrad who had died on August 3; Ford's A Portrait appeared in the September, October, November and December issues. The quality of the review became increasingly uneven, and there was a valedictory quality even in the November issue, where Ford announced that there would be no more instalments of Some Do Not. He was more and more engrossed in his own writing and his personal life was complicated by his affair with Jean Rhys, which began in October; the winding up of the review was inevitable. Stella Bowen believed that "Ford felt very badly about closing down and we both went through a great deal of anguish before accepting the fact that by no possible means could it be continued." However, she also noted that giving up the review was not a personal disaster for Ford. "The loss of editorship could not inflict a mortal wound upon a man who was just embarking upon the best creative work of his life. He had something else to think about."³ The something else was, of course, Parade's End, and Ford relinquished his second review much more easily than the first.

When the review ended, Ford suggested to his readers that the stoppage was purely

¹ Ford to Monroe Wheeler, Nov. 24, 1924, Ludwig, pp.163-164.

² Ernest Hemingway to Gertrude Stein and Alice Toklas, Aug. 9, 1924, Selected Letters, p.121.

³ Drawn From Life, p 131.

temporary. "Once more, towards the spring the transatlantic review will resume its tranquil voyage."¹ It is unlikely that Ford was serious about restarting the review again so quickly, though he did write to Jeanne Foster early in 1925 that he would have been willing to take it up again if "anyone else would turn up another couple of thousand pounds, and which is much more important, take over the business management."² He never quite lost the idea of a revival; for example, Poli cites unpublished letters from the Loewe Collection at Cornell dated 1927, in which Ford was writing to Stella Bowen about plans and finance to restart the review.³ In March 1939, three months before he died, he was actively trying to restart it, writing to potential backers and helpers for support. It was, he wrote, a project "I have long wanted to do." If Ford, old, tired and ill, wanted "to restart the Transatlantic Review as an organ of the Seven Arts and the Three Democracies", then he, at least, thought of his editorial project as continuous and worthwhile.

Failure

The chaos associated with the publication of The Transatlantic Review was, if anything, even greater than that surrounding The English Review and influenced practically every aspect of the review's life - its production, its editorial policy and practice and above all its finances.

The biggest complication in the production of the review arose out of the policy decision to make it an international journal with Paris, London and New York editions. Not only

¹ Transatlantic Review, Dec. 1924, 686.

² Ford, to Jeanne Foster, Mar 26, 1925, Ford/ Foster Friendship, 189.

³ Poli, p.133.

did this mean that binding and distribution problems were tripled, but also that Ford's chance of keeping control of the production processes was greatly reduced. Even in Paris, where at least he could offer direct supervision, "Everything that could possibly go wrong with regard to the printing, paper, packing, forwarding and distribution, did go wrong."¹

The first problem was with the Paris printers, Imprimerie Cosmos, who according to Ford were Russian and mad.² Because they were unable to pay their paper makers, they bound all but a few complimentary copies with "a binding made apparently of white toilet paper."³ Not surprisingly, this produced angry cables from Quinn, and prompted Joyce to write to Robert McAlmon that he thought the review was very shabby.⁴ The lower case title of the review was not a deliberate decision to go for *avant garde* typography, but simply a printer's strategy for getting the distinguishing word, transatlantic, into the largest possible type. The second and subsequent numbers of the review were printed by Herbert Clarke, who did a better job, though any printer who places an advertisement in a review, stating "This Rewiew [sic] is printed by..." does not inspire confidence.⁵ The proofs of the Joyce 'Work in Progress' were so bad that Joyce had to ask for an extension. He complained to Ford; "Not only has it not been read, but many of the most glaring blunders are still in it ... the printer seems still to be learning his trade."⁶ Hemingway complained to Gertrude Stein, with complete justification, that "Their September number was a

¹ Drawn From Life, p.116.

² It Was The Nightingale, p.301.

³ *Ibid.*, p.306.

⁴ James Joyce to Robert McAlmon, early 1924, Letters of James Joyce, Vol.1, p.209.

⁵ Transatlantic Review, February 1924, 120.

⁶ James Joyce to Ford, Mar. 16, 1924, The Letters of James Joyce, Vol III, ed. Richard Ellman (London: 1966), p. 90.

disgrace with typographical errors."¹ There were problems, too, in sorting out paper and typeface. Number one was printed on inferior paper and used three different typefaces. All subsequent issues were printed on stiffer paper and used smaller but uniform type. In March the cover was redesigned and the typeface on it matched the type of the content, and the cover paper was changed from a shiny white, which became dirty very quickly, for a cream matt paper.

Distribution in London, where the review was published by Duckworth, seems to have been straightforward, and Ford praised Duckworth's efficiency and generosity, which included a loan when Ford went to the States on review business.² In Paris, Ford was "deluged with complaints as to difficulty in obtaining the review from booksellers advertised as stocking it" though he confessed himself unable to help since there was so little profit for the bookseller for selling it.³ He also created his own difficulties, by proposing that the editorial staff of the review would supply new English and American books at cost, thus undercutting local booksellers; this offer first appeared in the May issue and was repeated in all but the last. Such a scheme aroused the wrath of Sylvia Beach, who retaliated by burying the review "somewhere so deep that the sales dropped from fifty in a month to nought."⁴ She also withdrew advertisements from the review from September onwards.

The biggest distribution difficulties occurred in the United States, where the review was

¹ Ernest Hemingway to Gertrude Stein and Alice Toklas, Sep. 14, 1924, Selected Letters, p.126.

² It Was The Nightingale, p.325.

³ Transatlantic Review, April 1924, 208.

⁴ Sylvia Beach to her mother, Aug.2, 1924, cited in Noel Riley Fitch, Sylvia Beach and the Lost Generation (New York;1983, London: 1985), p. 186.

published by Ford's new American publisher, Thomas Seltzer, though Quinn had warned Ford that although Seltzer had a flair for literature, "as a business man I think he is lacking in energy, in ideas, in enterprise."¹ Ford found this out the hard way, complaining to his American editor, Jeanne Foster; "The continual lateness of delivery here and the delays in New York make it impossible to publish in New York before the tenth of each month." He also complained of not knowing how many copies were needed for the American operation. "There is no need for me to go to the expense of printing and freight on 2000 copies if he doesn't expect to sell more than 1000."²

There were also problems with the censors, both official and unofficial. Sisley Huddleston, the Paris correspondent of The Times, was called in to arbitrate about the chances of Joyce's 'Work in Progress' being censored. Huddleston reported "that whatever impropriety there might be would not be visible to the naked eye of a British or American policeman."³ Huddleston also had to intervene with the American Consul, who had withdrawn Ford's visa for his visit to the United States, because of an anonymous written complaint that Ford was going for immoral purposes.⁴ The American Women's Club in Paris burned the February number of the review as a protest against what its members felt was the indecency of George Pillement's short play 'Ah Que d'Amour Gache Sans Profit Pour Personne'. When Ford countered this charge and also charges of communism in the March issue, the women's club cancelled its subscription. Ford also reported that the British Embassy withdrew its subscription after Baroness Elsa von Freytag Loringhoven turned

¹ John Quinn to Ford, Feb.5, 1924, Ford / Foster Friendship, 205.

² Ford to Jeanne Foster, April 8, 1924, Ibid., 188.

³ Sisley Huddleston, Bohemian Literary and Social Life in Paris: Salons, Cafes, Studios (London: 1928), p.264.

⁴ Ibid., p.142.

up there, in "a brassiere of milk tins connected by dog chains, and wearing on her head a plum cake", and asking for Ford, who had agreed to help her get her 'permis de séjour' extended.¹

There were organisational difficulties caused by the editor's lack of time. Ford was extremely busy during the months when The Transatlantic Review was being planned and published, partly with his own novel writing; he acknowledged the difficulties which this caused. "You cannot write and conduct a Review - at least, you cannot write well."² Since he was writing well, it was the review which suffered. Some Do Not appeared in book form in April, 1924, and he was hard at work on No More Parades. He was also actively involved in other journalism; he wrote regularly for the Paris edition of The Chicago Tribune, for example, throughout 1924. During this year he also had to make overseas visits, to England to visit his mother who was gravely ill, and to the United States - this was the visit to see John Quinn, which has already been discussed. Not surprisingly, Ford relied heavily on a series of assistants, a few of whom were extremely competent, but too many of whom were inept or cantankerous.

The most efficient of these assistants was Marjorie Reid, the review's advertising manager; without her, it would have folded sooner. Her role "expanded to include everything from routine matters of copy and proof readings, make-up etc. to receiving some of Ford's colleagues, critics, publishers' and distributors' representatives and others when he could not or would not be available."³ Also invaluable to the review was the American editor,

¹ It Was The Nightingale, p.310.

² Ibid., p.259.

³ Marjorie Reid to Bernard Poli, April 15, 1964, Poli, pp.28-29.

Jeanne Foster, secretary, art buyer and companion to John Quinn. Her functions were defined by Ford: "to give a first reading to mss. and forward a selection to myself and to settle any editorial questions for the decision of which there would not be time to refer to me - such as refusing advertisements and the like."¹ She had an office in Seltzer's publishing headquarters at 5, West 50th Street, New York, and exercised considerable editorial control. Ford relied on her judgement, asking her to provide material when he himself was under pressure. "I should be quite glad of some good stuff as, with all the business managing I have to do here, I have absolutely no time to do any editing and the review gets just thrown together which is bad for it."² Foster also wrote the occasional 'American Letter' for the review.

During the planning stages of the review, Ford was assisted unofficially by Ezra Pound, who threw himself with his usual enthusiasm into extracting contributions, and officially by two sub-editors, a totally hopeless White Russian, and a young English poet, Basil Bunting, who had just been released from jail through the intervention of Pound. The White Russian seems not to have lasted very long, but Bunting was a kind of general factotum to the review, probably from October 1923 until January 1924. He corrected proofs for Some Do Not as well as for the review, and was for a time the company secretary of the Société Anonyme Transatlantic Review - a requirement of French law. Sometimes, when things went wrong, he acted as a shoulder for Ford to weep on; it was "very uncomfortable for a young man of twenty-two to have somebody a generation older than himself and very heavy weeping on his shoulder." Finally, "when there was nothing

¹ Ford to Jeanne Foster, Jan. 22, 1924, Ford / Foster Friendship, 185.

² Ibid., Feb. 22, 1924, 187.

else needed doing, I would sometimes bath the baby."¹ Although Bunting left when he felt that he couldn't cope with Ford's bursts of anguish any longer, he did write a review of Conrad's The Rover for the July issue. Another young writer, the American Ivan Beede, may have taken over from Bunting to help with the review before Hemingway arrived, though Ford referred to Beede as one of a succession of sub-editors which he and Hemingway had working for them.² Both Beede and Hemingway had work published in the review.

Ford's next assistant editor, and the one who caused him the most difficulties, was Ernest Hemingway, who, like Bunting, was recruited for the review by Ezra Pound. Within three weeks of arriving in Paris at the end of January 1924, he had persuaded Gertrude Stein to allow The Making of Americans to be published in the review and was boasting both to Stein and to Ford of this achievement. "I made it clear that it was a remarkable scoop for his magazine obtained only through my obtaining genius."³ However, he failed to make clear to Ford the length of Stein's book, and he seems to have misled Stein about the amount of money its serialisation might bring her, though he did negotiate 30 francs a page.⁴

Hemingway's problem was that he disliked and resented Ford, as he disliked and resented most people who tried to help him or who seemed to pose any kind of personal or literary challenge. Hemingway's biographer, Carlos Baker, acknowledges Hemingway's paranoia

¹ Transcript of 'The Only Uncle of the Gifted Young', introduced by Tony Gould, and broadcast by the BBC on Feb. 15, 1974, 9.

² It Was The Nightingale, p.311.

³ Ernest Hemingway to Gertrude Stein, Feb. 17, 1924, Selected Letters, p.111.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.112.

over Ford;¹ certainly his letters during 1924 are full of bitterness towards him. On March 17, for example, he wrote to Ezra Pound, that "Ford had never recovered in a literary way from the murricale, or however you spell it, mirricale maybe, of his having been a soldier ... I'm going to start denying I was in the war, for fear I shall get like Ford to myself about it."² On May 2, again to Pound, he declared that "the only thing to do with Ford is to kill him", and complained savagely about Ford's editorial standards. "Anything Ford will take and publish can be took and published in Century Harper's etc, except Tzara and such shit in French." He also criticised Ford for ruining his "New York Paris letter" which he thought was amusing. "He changes it, revises it, cuts it, makes it have not any sense etc."³

Hemingway was devious in his relationship with Ford, being apparently friendly with him, but attacking him behind his back. The biggest piece of backstabbing came with Hemingway's editing of the review while Ford was in the United States on review business in June. Ford had left the July issue almost ready for the printer, but Hemingway, probably on purpose, failed to tidy up Ford's jottings for 'Chroniques' so that they appear disjointed and incoherent. The August issue appeared in a blaze of Hemingway self-publicity, in an orange wrapper proclaiming it to be a 'Pan American Number Specially Edited by Mr. Ernest Hemingway'. Inside, Hemingway removed the month's installment of Some Do Not and the Ionides Memories, inserting instead three poems by Elsa Von Freytag Loringhoven, whom Ford was anxious to avoid publishing. In the same issue, Hemingway also criticised Tzara as a translator. Ford's reaction was dignified, though not without bite. In an article 'And From The United States' he drew attention to Hemingway's

¹ Carlos Baker, Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story (New York: 1969, repr. London, 1988), p.206.

² Ernest Hemingway to Ezra Pound, March 17, 1924, Ibid., p.113.

³ Ernest Hemingway to Ezra Pound, May 2, 1924, Ibid., p.116.

editorship. "It must prove an agreeable change for the Reader and it provides him with an unusually large sample of the work of that Young America whose claims we have so insistently but not with such efficiency - forced upon our readers."¹

Having stirred things up for the review, Hemingway left for Pamplona, and then complained to Pound that Ford refused to answer his letters. "I suppose he is sore at me though Christnose I tried to run his paper the way he would have liked it run, except for not publishing J.J.Adams and such poets."² In September the row went public with Hemingway's 'Pamplona Letter', the tone of which is snide. It is in effect a personal attack on Ford, ending with a sneer about Ford's love of autobiographical anecdote. "It is only when you no longer believe in your own exploits that you write your memoirs."³

The final straw was Hemingway's gratuitously offensive obituary of Conrad in the October issue and it is perhaps surprising that Ford published it, bearing in mind Ford's esteem for Conrad. However he did not believe in censorship, and he may also have thought that its publication would bring its own retribution on its author, who insulted Conrad, Eliot and Ford.

It is agreed by most people I know that Conrad is a bad writer, just as it is agreed that T.S.Eliot is a good writer. If I knew that by grinding Mr. Eliot into a fine dry powder and sprinkling that powder over Mr. Conrad's grave Mr. Conrad would shortly appear, looking very annoyed at the forced return to commence writing, I would leave for London early tomorrow morning with a sausage grinder.⁴

Ford apologised for Hemingway's attack in the November issue, wishing that he could have

¹Transatlantic Review, Aug. 1924, 213.

² Ernest Hemingway to Ezra Pound, July 19, 1924, Selected Letters, p.119.

³Transatlantic Review, Sep. 1924, 301.

⁴ Ibid., Oct. 1924, 342.

removed the offending paragraphs. He hesitated for a long time over the ethics of the matter, deciding that "in the end our standards must prevail. We had invited that writer to write, we had indicated no limits to his bloodthirstiness; our hands fell powerless to our sides."¹

All these difficulties of production and distribution could perhaps have been overcome if the finances of the review had been on a sound footing, but Ford and sound financial management did not go together. Untangling the details of the review's financial history is virtually impossible, since even fewer records exist for this than for The English Review. An additional complication arises from the fact that different commentators give amounts in francs or sterling or dollars and all of them seem to have operated on different exchange rates.²

There was considerable money invested in the review, though any figures are necessarily tentative and approximate, depending on the exchange rate used for conversion, and on the source from which such figures are drawn. John Quinn paid \$1000 towards the review in October 1923, and two further amounts of \$500 in January 1924, although he accepted that he would see no return for his money, writing to the French lawyer, Maître Legrand; "I think it is lost money. But I said I would stand by Ford to that extent and I have kept my word."³ Ford himself invested the money from the sale of the cottage - about £400 - together with some of Stella Bowen's money, so that his initial investment was roughly the

¹ Ibid., Nov. 550.

² The prices charged for the review give approximate exchange rates of \$5 or 50 francs to £1 and 10 francs to \$1. This is a marginally higher rate of exchange than anything obtained by converting figures given by Ford, Quinn, Poli et al, but since the franc was falling against both the dollar and sterling in 1924, and since the arithmetic is relatively easy, these are the conversion rates I have used where necessary.

³ John Quinn to Maître Legrand, Jan. 27, 1924, cited in B.L.Reid, The Man from New York: John Quinn and his Friends (New York: 1968), p.615.

same as Quinn's. After the review closed, Ford claimed that he and Stella had invested 120,000 francs of their own money in the review, including all the money he had received from the English edition of Some Do Not and \$300 from the American edition.¹ When it was necessary, Stella withdrew small amounts of her capital from Australia, "considering that I was investing it in a promising career."² Another 40,000 francs came from Krebs Friend and others, including Gertrude Stein, Natalie Barney, William C. Bullett and Nancy Cunard who subscribed to a share issue in May. Jeanne Foster in New York was also trying to raise money through share subscriptions, although this was very difficult because, under French company law, the review had to be registered in France.³ The total amount invested in the review was around 180,000 francs or nearly £3,600 pounds.

The other sources of income were advertisements and sales. The review charged 25 francs per half line, or 200 francs per ten half lines for advertisements. It is difficult to translate these figures into the half or full page charges which would have been paid for most of the advertisements; there must have been discounts for the large full page advertisements which appeared in several issues of the review and in any case, not all the advertisements were paid for. The inside of the front cover of the first issue carried the announcement that the review "contains and will contain no unpaid advertisement except for exchanges with other reviews or publishers." This policy would have exempted Duckworth and William Bird's Three Mountains Press, both of which advertised extensively in the review. There were, however, four pages of advertisements at both front and rear of most issues, together with advertisements on the inside of the front cover and on both sides of the back cover.

¹ It Was The Nightingale, p.325.

² Drawn From Life, p.10.

³ Ford to Jeanne Foster, Feb. 22, 1924, Ford / Foster Friendship, 187.

By August, the advertisements at the back of the review had increased to eight pages, and even allowing for the free pages and the considerable amount of self advertisement, the income must have been considerable. Using 500 francs as a possible income for a full page of advertisements, and allowing for three free pages in every issue, the advertising revenue for twelve months was not far short of 40,000 francs, that is, roughly equivalent to Ford's and Quinn's original contribution. Ford claimed: "We have more than paid for the first number by the Paris advertisements alone and if the New York and London advertisements are anything like the same rate I ought to be able to buy the moon in the shape of contributions."¹ This sounds like yet another example of Ford's incurable optimism where money was concerned, but the first appointment which Ford made to the review staff was that of Majorie Reid as advertising manager. Her salary always had first call on the review expenses, which is a measure of the importance attached to advertising revenue.² Some of the advertising seems to have been effective; the Contact Publishing Company wrote that of the responses it had received from three advertising sources, most had come from The Transatlantic Review.³

Income from sales is impossible to estimate. The review sold for 2/- in the United Kingdom, for 50 cents in the States and for five francs, raised to seven francs 50 in May, in France. These prices were reasonably competitive. Blackwoods and The Bookman both sold for half a crown, while The Criterion and The Fortnightly Review cost 3/6; Broom and The Dial both sold for 50 cents. The French edition, particularly at its higher price, was relatively more expensive; Les Marges, for example, cost only two francs and the

¹ Ford to H.G.Wells, Nov. 15, 1923, Ludwig, p.158.

² It Was The Nightingale, p.329.

³ Transatlantic Review, May, 1924, 384.

fortnightly Le Mercure de France, three francs 50. Adrienne Monnier's Commerce, however, which first appeared in June 1924, was, at ten francs, even more expensive than The Transatlantic Review. So the review did not price itself out of the market, though Ford alluded again in September to the difficulties which some readers were having in obtaining it from Paris bookshops. Perhaps Sylvia Beach was not the only Parisien bookseller to want to strike back at the review's offer to obtain books for its readers.

Figures for sales can be no more than speculative. There are no figures for print runs; William Bird told Poli that he could not remember how many copies of the review were printed, only "that many copies were given away or left unsold in the office basement."¹ In the last number of the review, Ford told his readers that "over 20,000 copies of the review vanished into the American scene, "that is about 1700 per issue."² But Krebs Friend, pressing an American acquaintance in New York to collect the money which Seltzer owed the review, referred to only 800 copies a month, that is, half Ford's number.³ Ford's figure may be correct, since in April he was writing to Jeanne Foster about reducing American distribution figures from 2000 to 1000.⁴ The figures hardly matter in terms of income since Seltzer did not hand over the money from sales.

What does seem to be clear is that the income from sales was limited and that it formed the smallest part of the review's revenue. Apart from difficulties in obtaining copies in Paris, Ford also reported that the review lacked readers in England, although even England

¹ Poli, p.94.

² Transatlantic Review, Dec. 1924, 685,

³ Ludwig, cited in a footnote, p.163.

⁴ Ford to Jeanne Foster, April 8, 1924, Ford/Foster Friendship, 188.

consumed more copies than the States. The biggest problem was in recovering income from American sales; only 25% of the copies shipped to the States were ever paid for.¹ Despite repeated efforts to extract information and money from Seltzer, Ford was fundamentally unsuccessful in resolving these problems. Only after the review had ceased publication did he receive some accounts which "showed practically no sales ... and a heavy debit against the review."²

On the face of it, the review's costs should not have exceeded income. Ford's own estimate was that it cost two to three cents a copy to produce, though he was vague about how he arrived at these figures. "The costs of production in Paris were ludicrously small; ... even distribution was very cheap, and office costs were almost nothing as compared with those of any journal in London or New York."³ Poli suggests that the production costs should be nearer ten cents a copy, though he, like Ford, gives no hint at the basis for this calculation. On a print run of 5000 copies per issue, Poli's estimate of production costs work out at a total of \$6000 or 72,000 francs for twelve issues. Neither Ford nor Poli mention advertising costs for the review, though such outgoings must have been less than for The English Review. Duckworth was the only one of its three publishers who made any attempt at systematic advertising, and even this was confined to small sections of larger Duckworth advertisements in January, February and March in The Spectator, The Times Literary Supplement and The New Statesman. The usual rate for full page advertisements was about fourteen guineas, so the review's eighth of a page share of these did not cost a great deal. There was no publicity in The Criterion and none of the contemporary French journals carried advertisements for it.

¹ Transatlantic Review, Dec. 1924, 684.

² It Was The Nightingale, p.337.

³ *Ibid.*, p.297.

The other obvious call on review expenses was payment to contributors, most of which was at the rate of 30 francs a page; this was the rate which Hemingway negotiated for Gertrude Stein for The Making of Americans and which Ford offered to A.E.Coppard for a short story. Coppard seems to have protested about this, since Ford was prepared to squeeze small additional amounts of payment for him.¹ This was possibly the rate which Ford felt that he was unable to offer W.B.Yeats. "Naturally I want to publish something of yours ... But I have been kept off asking you by the rather miserable rate of pay that I was able to offer." Since Ford did not write to Yeats until after the poet had been awarded the Nobel prize for literature in November of 1923, and Ford congratulated him in almost sycophantic terms on his achievement, he may have been hoping that Yeats in his euphoria would offer him a free contribution.² There is no record of Yeats' reply, but certainly nothing of his appeared in The Transatlantic Review. Conrad was offered £25 for his share of The Nature of a Crime.³ Ford and Pound's own contributions were unpaid.⁴ Poli estimates that payments to contributors absorbed about 3000 francs an issue, that is 36,000 francs for the twelve months.⁵ This, plus the estimated 72,000 francs for production costs comes to 108,000 francs, more than the review's original capital, but less than this capital plus advertising revenue. Yet by May, the review was in such serious financial difficulties that Ford tried, unsuccessfully, to raise 150,000 francs by a share issue; only a few friends subscribed. Contributors were not always paid promptly. For example, Hemingway's correspondence with Gertrude Stein in the autumn of 1924 is

¹ Ford to A.E.Coppard, Oct. 15, 1923, Ludwig, p.155.

² Ford to W.B.Yeats, Nov.23, 1923, Letters to W.B.Yeats, Vol. I, ed. Richard J. Finneran, George Mills Harper and William M. Murphy, (London: 1977) pp.444-445.

³ Ford to Conrad, Nov. 8, 1923, Ibid., p.157.

⁴ Ford to Gertrude Stein, Sep. 18, 1924, Ibid., p.162.

⁵ Poli, p.94.

preoccupied with extracting her payments.¹ Despite the funds which were put into the review by Krebs Friend and by Ford himself, the review accumulated considerable debts, which Ford, as late as 1934, had not paid off. "Alas, I have not succeeded in liquidating the debts it caused me to incur. I do not suppose I ever shall."²

There were obviously other expenses which were a drain on the review's money, some of it in the form of salaries, though only Marjorie Reid seems to have been paid regularly. There are no figures for payment to assistant editors; when Hemingway complained that he had only received 150 francs from the review, it isn't clear whether he was referring to salary or to payment for his short stories.³ Probably the biggest single factor which damaged the review's finances was Quinn's stipulation that the review should be turned into a limited company according to French law. Ford was convinced that this was "the undoing of the review. The charges for founding and registering that company exhausted nearly half our original capital."⁴ This is confirmed by Basil Bunting, who was company secretary and who remembered "going about for the whole of one weekend with several thousand pounds in my pocket," presumably to pay for the company registration.⁵ Clearly this was a large and unexpected drain on the review's resources, and there were also associated bureaucratic problems created by "the inflexible Maître L",⁶ almost certainly the Maître Legrand to whom Quinn had written on January 27. Ford explained what was involved.

¹ Selected Letters, pp.120-127.

² It Was The Nightingale, p.298.

³ Hemingway to Edward O'Brien, May 2, 1924, Selected Letters, p.117.

⁴ It Was The Nightingale, p.297.

⁵ Gould transcript, 9.

⁶ It Was The Nightingale, p.209.

Before you can raise new capital you have to advertise in the papers your proposed amount. You cannot, I mean, go to the public with a proposal to sell shares; you must have the actual money in hand. Then the Notaire has to advertise in the official organs that he actually has the money in hand - then you can issue the shares but not before.¹

Not surprisingly, Ford claimed that the legal formalities "caused me more labours and loss of time than all the rest of the Review together."² He refers amusingly to the incident, describing the lawyer as "a cultivated, agreeable, aesthetically minded gentleman outside his Étude, but inside it something between a Pope and an Executioner", but the experience was, he said, "like being mad."³ Had Quinn been able to exert more authority, on Legrand, on Ford himself, or on Seltzer in the United States, things might have been more efficiently and economically managed; his illness and death were a great blow to Ford. As he wrote to Gertrude Stein, "I would like you to understand that owing to Quinn's defection and then death I have had an immense amount of trouble with the review and have lost what is, for me, a good deal of money."⁴

Some of the financial difficulties must be blamed directly on Ford's own mismanagement and extravagance. His two trips abroad, especially that to the States, were not free, and the Thursday teas and the Friday dances associated with the review would not have come cheaply. The major witness to Ford's financial ineptness is Hemingway, though allowances must be made for his vindictiveness towards Ford. Hemingway accused Ford of mishandling the financial rescue package which was available from Krebs Friend. Ford refused the offer of regular cash payments, and instead "stayed up all night writing pneumatiques and spent 100s of francs on taxis to get 500 francs out of Natalie Barney and

¹ Ford to Jeanne Foster, February 22, 1924, Ford / Foster Friendship, 187.

² It Was The Nightingale, p.297.

³ Ford Madox Ford, A Mirror to France, (London: 1926), pp.123-124.

⁴ Ford to Gertrude Stein, Sep. 18, 1924, Ludwig, p. 162.

that sort of business." By refusing the regular payments offered by Friend, Ford missed a great opportunity. "Where Ford could have had more money than he is getting out of him and no strings now he has every kind of string and every kind of New England tightness through Mrs. Krebs."¹ By October, Hemingway was practically incandescent with rage at what he saw as Ford's mismanagement of the review, suggesting that his own efforts alone were keeping it going. "I have had a constant fight to keep it on being published since Mrs. Friend conceived the bright idea of reducing the expenses of the magazine by trying to drop everything they would have to pay for." The blame was entirely Ford's and Hemingway added the charge of deception to that of incompetence. "When you consider that the review was dead, that there was never going to be another number and that Ford was cancelling subscriptions in August (this Ford has forgotten and Krebs never knew) it is something to have it last the year out ... Ford is an absolute liar and crook."²

Even allowing for Hemingway's spleen, it is obvious that the review and its finances were seriously out of control for most of 1924 and that there was no financial strategy. While Ford accepted that "the business arrangements were impossible to handle," and felt that the French company lawyer should have done more to help,³ he made only a passing reference to Krebs Friend's supposed tight fistedness. Apologising to Gertrude Stein for delays in paying her, he wrote that "the business management has passed to my immense relief, out of my hands into those of a capitalist who is a little slow with money."⁴ There is no suggestion of major difficulties with Friend and his wife, or indeed with Hemingway

¹ Hemingway to Gertrude Stein and Alice Toklas, Aug. 9, 1924, Selected Letters, p.120.

² Hemingway to Gertrude Stein and Alice Toklas, Oct. 10, 1924, *Ibid.*, p. 127.

³ It Was The Nightingale, pp.325 & 329.

⁴ Ford to Gertrude Stein, Sep. 18, 1924, Ludwig, p.162.

himself, either in Ford's correspondence, or in his account of the review in It Was The Nightingale. On the other hand, as with The English Review, there is no suggestion that Ford was ready to blame himself for the review's troubles. His zeal and enthusiasm for what his reviews could achieve are countered by an irresponsibility towards organisation, finance and management which amounts to negligence, and this seriously undermines some of the claims, outlined in the Introduction, about his greatness as an editor.

What most distinguished The Transatlantic Review from The English Review was the ambiguity and lack of conviction of its editorial policy. It wasn't simply that the earlier review, despite problems of editorial control, was much more categorically Ford's venture, but more that Ford seemed uncertain about what he wanted The Transatlantic Review to be. He claimed that it had only two purposes, the first "that of widening the field in which younger writers of the day can find publication" and the second "that of introducing into international politics a note more genial than that which almost internationally prevails."¹ The two aims were for Ford connected because he saw "the books and the arts of nations"² as the best possible kind of ambassadors. The aims sound grand and worthy and wholly consistent with Ford's own principles, but in practice, there were, in 1924, numerous outlets in Paris for young authors, and Ford's own geniality failed him in the attacks on the British left which formed the substance of his political commentaries in the first three issues of the review. The aims and contents of The Transatlantic Review were also necessarily diffuse because it was an international publication, drawing on contributors and readers from three cultures, though the decision to publish in this way seems simply to have arisen out of the circumstances in which Ford found himself. It was edited in Paris because that was where he was and "because there is no other home possible for a review which desires to spread comprehension between three nations."³ It was published in England because of Ford's close links with Duckworth and in the United States because of Ford's affection for that country and because he was surrounded in Paris by so many

¹ Transatlantic Review Prospectus, reproduced in South Lodge, p.143.

² *Ibid.*, p. 143.

³ *Ibid.*

young American writers. Additionally, Ford was less committed to The Transatlantic Review than to his earlier editorial venture, since he started it almost by accident, as a result of a chance encounter with his brother, and he was, in any case, more involved in and contented with his own work as a novelist than he had been in 1909.

All the evidence suggests that Ford found editing The Transatlantic Review a much happier experience than editing The English Review. "There is so much sport to be got out of running a periodical devoted to the discovery of young talent in literature that I am astonished how rare the pursuit is among the rich of the earth."¹ It may be that he enjoyed himself so much that he partially lost sight of what he wanted it to do. Some of the time he felt that the new journal was simply another version of the earlier one, believing that it would "be the old English Review all over again."² The initial publicity for the new venture traded quite heavily on the reputation of the earlier review and its editor,³ suggesting that Ford had not really thought through what should be distinctive about the new one. The communications section of the first number of The Transatlantic Review, where Ford introduced letters from contributors to The English Review, also suggests that he saw the new venture as an extension of an earlier process. "One man has a try and fails; then another and fails again. The man number one takes it up again and one attempt is but the rebirth of the older failure."⁴

Yet there was one major difference in the aims of The Transatlantic Review. While it

¹ 'Declined with Thanks', New York Herald Tribune Books, I, 6, June 24, 1928, cited in Harvey, p.253.

² Ford to Douglas Goldring, October 15, 1923, cited in South Lodge, p.142.

³ South Lodge, p.145.

⁴ Transatlantic Review, Jan. 1924, 93.

shared with the earlier review the desire to provide a forum for young writers, it was much more explicit about what Ford saw as the internationality of letters. "The aim of the Review is to help in bringing about a state of things in which it will be considered that there are no English, no French ... Literatures: there will be only literature."¹ Ford's introduction to a collection of short stories, reprinted from the review in 1926, reaffirmed this belief. "I have lived all my life one continuing passion: one unfailing ambition ... that good letters should prevail. I don't care who writes them, whether American or French."² Both aims were repeated in the full page self advertisement which appeared in the September issue of The Transatlantic Review. After listing writers and artists who had contributed to the review, the advertisement proclaimed its success in meeting its objectives. "These were primarily to encourage the younger practitioners of the arts in the three countries which it serves; secondarily to make those countries acquainted with the intellectual activities practised in the countries united by the North Atlantic Ocean."³ What all these declarations fail to acknowledge is the extent to which the international agenda was overwhelmed by the American contributions to the review, and its failure really to encourage "the younger practitioners" in France and England.

There are other significant absences in these Transatlantic Review declarations. The anger about Anglo Saxondom indifference to culture and the crusading fervour on behalf of literature, which were such a hall mark of The English Review are missing from declarations of intent and surface only mildly in Ford's 'Stocktaking' articles in The Transatlantic Review itself. Despite Ford's claim that he "was convinced at that juncture

¹ Ibid., p.144.

² transatlantic stories: Selected from The Transatlantic Review, introduced by Ford Madox Ford (London: 1926), p.xxviii.

³ Transatlantic Review, Sept. 1924, XII.

that some such review was a necessity,"¹ he simply did not feel the need for his new journal in the way that he had felt passionately about the need for The English Review, and this lack of urgency revealed itself both in the way in which he allowed the review to develop, and in the kind of policy decisions which he took, or which he allowed to be taken.

There were other, less convincing aims claimed for the review. Writing to A.E.Coppard, Ford stated: "It isn't an exaggeration to say that I've started this review with you in mind as I started the English Review to publish stuff of Hardy's that other periodicals wouldn't publish."² It was an exaggeration since Coppard's work had appeared in Coterie and The Spectator. When Coppard's long short story 'The Higgler' was published in the May issue, Ford claimed that it was the review's policy to "try to find room for work of every length as of every character" unlike ordinary commercial magazines which would only print stories of 1500 to 4000 words. Certainly the prose which the review printed varied greatly in length, but this was not unusual in cultural journals of the time.³ When The Transatlantic Review was in difficulties, Hemingway claimed to Gertrude Stein that "the only reason the magazine was saved was to publish your stuff."⁴ Hemingway was here defending what he saw as his own major coup for the review.

The English Review had offered a fairly well-balanced blend of past and present, of the work of dead and established living authors combined with the work of unpublished

¹ It Was The Nightingale, p.296.

² Ford to A.E.Coppard, Sept. 28, 1923, Ludwig, p.152.

³ Pierre Hamp's short story, 'Le Bon Hotelier', (Mar.1924) is 1400 words, while A.E. Coppard's 'The Higgler', (May 1924) is slightly over 10,000 words.

⁴ Hemingway to Gertrude Stein, Sept. 14, 1924, Selected Letters, p.125.

writers. The Transatlantic Review failed to achieve this kind of balance. It contained no work by famous dead writers, and a number of famous living writers, including T.S.Eliot, declined to contribute. Although Ford denied that there had been "difficulties in obtaining from an unmoved world these personal utterances,"¹ several English Review contributors, including Hardy, H.G.Wells and Conrad, while wishing the new review well, declined to write for it, and Ford had to be content with printing their letters. The most that Conrad would agree to was the republishing of The Nature of a Crime and some brief notes on the collaboration between himself and Ford when the story was first written. Since this had first appeared in The English Review fifteen years earlier, it was hardly likely to make the new review seem to be the height of modernity and originality. Its republication, though prompted by Ford's deep affection and admiration for Conrad, was an error of judgement.

Another error was the publication of Memories by Luke Ionides, an elderly Greek expatriate, who was born in 1837. These reminiscences, which were dictated to Pound's mother-in-law, Dorothy Shakespeare, and which were serialised from January to July and again in September and October, recalled the author's contacts with Morris, Wagner, Rossetti, Whistler, Burne Jones and other nineteenth century figures. While Ford, with his own childhood memories of Victorian figures and his feeling for the continuity of cultural practice, valued such recollections, they did not appeal to younger contributors which is why Hemingway omitted them from the August issue. Towards the end of the review's career, Ford claimed that it did not "give publicity to work of one particular school" though the preponderance of American prose writing contradicts this assertion. He also argued that his sympathies were "with the newer sincerities so that newer sincerities offer

¹ Transatlantic Review, Jan. 1924, 93.

themselves more frequently than the older consummatenesses for our publication."¹ The florid nature of Ford's prose here hints at a certain facetiousness, which disguises both a difficulty in providing a balance of contributions, and the gulf which separated the works of nostalgia from contemporary American writing.

There is considerable evidence that Ford could not find the range and quality of contributions he wanted. Sisley Huddleston, who was in regular contact with Ford during 1924, referred in general terms to "the difficulties of finding suitable material."² Ezra Pound reported to Huddleston that Ford only printed serials because he "was absoLOOTely up a tree and cdnt. get decent stuff enough to fill his space except for nuvvelists who wdnt. write anything else."³ Pound exaggerated the amount of serialisation, since the only serialised fiction was Ford's own Some Do Not and Gertrude Stein's The Making of Americans, and the only serialised non-fiction was the Ionides Memories and Ford's tribute to Conrad, but his comment is emphatic about the nature of Ford's difficulties. It was a view which he repeated to James Joyce. "I think, and always have thought, that sample of 'woik in progress' stunt was bad. The trans. did it because there simply wasn't enough copy to fill the so large review."⁴ Pound was wrong about Joyce's 'Work in Progress' since Ford had from the outset been determined to publish something by Joyce in his review and getting Joyce to agree to this was probably his biggest achievement as the review's editor. The letter does, however, confirm Pound's sense that Ford simply didn't have enough material; he had been actively involved in the affairs of

¹ Ibid., Nov. 1924, 549-550.

² Back to Montparnasse, p.124.

³ Bohemian, Literary and Social Life in Paris, p.264.

⁴ Pound to Joyce, Jan. 2, 1927, Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, ed. Forrest Reid (London: 1968), p.229.

the review, and was not given to Hemingway's vindictiveness, so there is probably some truth in his claim.

Some of the shortage was caused by the refusal, already noted, of English Review contributors to provide new work. Of Ford's 'discoveries' for The English Review, only Pound provided material for the new venture, though he tried, in vain, to recruit Wyndham Lewis. "Policy of the review certainly favourable to yr. activities, though I have heard you express unfavourable opinion of the editor. ANNY how, I can assure you that yr. work will be opera grata to management."¹ In the same letter, Pound indicated that Ford did not want anything from the "Lawrence, Murry, Mansfield contingent." No reason is given for this, although Ford's relationship with Lawrence had deteriorated since The English Review days, and Murry had written a savage review of Ford's Thus to Revisit in The Nation and Athenaeum in May 1921.

So it is hardly surprising that Ford complained of how few manuscripts came from England and observed that "eighty per cent of the manuscripts in English that I received came from west of Altoona." There was apparently no difficulty in finding the French contributions, but despite this, Ford acknowledged that although he had tried to divide the review into three equal parts, "the preponderating share of its pages went to the Middle West."² The proportion of American writing increased as the year went by, partly because of Hemingway's influence as assistant editor, and partly because Ford relied increasingly on the efforts of Jeanne Foster in New York to find suitable manuscripts. This reliance on American help, together with the number of Americans already in Paris and anxious to see

¹ Pound to Wyndham Lewis, Oct. 7, 1923, The Letters of Ezra Pound and Wyndham Lewis, ed. Timothy Materer (London: 1985), pp.137-138.

² It Was The Nightingale, pp.135-136.

their writing in print, meant that the review rapidly acquired an American bias.

With the obvious exception of the art, music and literature supplements, The Transatlantic Review was not too different from The English Review, either in appearance or in layout, although it was shorter by some thirty to fifty pages. Unlike some other contemporary cultural journals such as The Chapbook and Littérature, The Transatlantic Review had a plain cover, with the title in lower case, and listing contents and the publishers and prices in London, Paris and New York. The only decoration was a small circular logo, with a ship at sea and the word 'Fluctuat', taken from the seal of the city of Paris; Adrienne Monnier's journal Le Navire d'Argent, which appeared in 1925, had a similar logo.

The contents varied from month to month, though a broadly similar pattern emerged. 'Verse', if there was any, came first; there was no verse section in March, May, July and November, and Ford complained about the absence of any poetry which was either "very strikingly unorthodox or very orthodoxly consummate,"¹ and he did not try to remedy this by publishing any of his own poetry.² The second, and by far the largest section was 'Prose', which included short stories, serialisation of novels and memoirs, occasional short prose dramas in French, and Ford's own commentary on the state of the arts, 'Stocktaking'. The serialisation of Some Do Not did not consistently appear in the prose section: in the first three issues it appeared at the end of the review, as did his Portrait of Conrad, which began life in the literary supplement.

¹ Transatlantic Review, Mar. 1924, 63.

²In the introduction to transatlantic stories, p.xxiii, Ford suggested that he had typed out some of his old published work, submitting it anonymously. It was rejected, though he doesn't say by whom. The story may be spurious since much of this introduction is devoted to a highly amusing account of running a review which bears little resemblance to what actually took place.

There were fewer non fiction articles than in The English Review, and most of these were on cultural topics. The exceptions were an article by Lincoln Steffens on the effect of the new economic policy in Russia, which appeared in February, and in July, there were several items of non-fiction; Paul Valéry's 'Variations sur une Pensée', reflections on death, William Carlos Williams' 'The Voyage of the Mayflower', on the stifling effects of Puritanism, 'The Evils of Geography', outlining the arbitrary irregularity of its influence on human history, by G.H. Powell, and 'The Problems of the World in Ruins' about the links between Italy and America, by Ludwig Nordstrom; this was continued in October. Finally, the November review contained some of Havelock Ellis' 'Diary Fragments' written two years earlier. The non-fiction contributions to The Transatlantic Review were not as extensive, nor as coherent nor as powerful as those in the earlier journal. Ford claimed that although he had been attacked for not providing "articles on subjects", he didn't think that 'subjects' were the review's affair.¹ The rag bag of non-fiction features outlined above gives the impression of an editor who was lacking a coherent policy for such contributions, and who was short of material or time, and in July and November, of both.

The contents of the section called 'Chroniques', a heading frequently used in French cultural journals, such as Action, Le Disque Vert and Littérature, varied from month to month, but was usually in three parts, each devoted to some aspect of cultural life in the three cities where the review was published; the French section frequently included writing specifically entitled 'Editorial'. 'Chroniques' was followed by 'Communications' which were letters to the editor and the editor's thoughts in return. In fact, it is not always easy to see the distinction between the two sections since similar material occurs in both, though the longer articles are usually in 'Chroniques'.

¹ Ibid., July 1924, 98.

Several issues had supplements; music supplements in February, May, August and November, art supplements in March and June and literary supplements, sometimes called 'Work in Progress' in April, July, September (the Conrad supplement), October and November. In addition, certain issues contained extra material such as notes on contributors called 'Ourselves', 'Notes and Reviews' and advertisements for the review. The presentation and organisation deteriorated during the second half of the year and the November number is particularly messy.

The nearest thing to an editorial in The Transatlantic Review, and the closest Ford came to repeating his 'Critical Attitude' articles from The English Review, was 'Stocktaking', written under the pseudonym, Daniel Chaucer.¹ 'Stocktaking's' subtitle was 'Towards a Revaluation of English Literature' and reiterates some of his earlier trenchant criticisms of contemporary cultural practice, but his approach was more relaxed as well as more idiosyncratic and anecdotal. "I do not apologize for putting these matters in anecdotes: they are more difficult to write than is the formal prose of the Reviewer, but they are easier to read and take up less time and, dealing as they do with the actual circumstances of humanity in the bulk they are more to be trusted than most merely thought out arguments."² Ford was a firm believer in the anecdote as a narrative as well as a critical technique, but here it is partly an excuse for a repetition of ideas expressed in his earlier review. Although he recognised that all values had been altered by the war, his complaint that Anglo-Saxondom had no literary standards and his criticism of the lack of culture in high places, make no reference to these alterations, simply reworking critical ideas articulated before the war.

¹ Ford had already used this pseudonym for his novels, The Simple Life Limited, which was published in 1911, and The New Humpty-Dumpty, published in 1912.

²Transatlantic Review, Jan. 1924, 74.

The February 'Stocktaking', called 'Axioms and Internationalisms', addressed the question of how one reads, "knowledge of books being entirely immaterial, knowledge of writing everything."¹ All that was needed was a knowledge of axioms, or the methods of writers, a knowledge which was widespread in foreign cultures, but "Anglo-Saxondom does not know that it has any arts."² The article outlined two criteria for good writing which Ford had identified in The English Review - the concern with technique and the concern that literature should be in touch with everyday life. These concerns were expanded in the March 'Stocktaking'. What was needed, he argued, was to "evolve and re-erect in English a literature that shall really be of the masses ... It is probably from the United States that the movement will come ... We, for the moment are too tired, too bowed down by vested interests, too poor; bled too white - and of our best blood."³ While this is unmistakably a reference to the cultural as well as the physical losses of the war, it also illustrates the internationalism which underlay The Transatlantic Review, as well as Ford's prescience about the direction which it was taking. However, while some of the American fiction published in the review was accessible, the work of Pound, Joyce and Stein can hardly be called literature of or for the masses; there is a conflict between theory and editorial practice here.

In April, 'Stocktaking' took up another of Ford's causes and launched into an attack on the intelligentsia, stressing what he saw as their natural tendency "to make of literature as unconsumable thing as may be, so that acting as its High Priests, they may make mediocre livings and cement their authority over an unlettered world." He distinguished clearly

¹ Ibid., Feb. 1924, 57.

² Ibid., 61.

³ Ibid., Mar 1924, 57.

between the writer, whose purpose was "to make man clear ... to his fellow men" and the intelligentsia who sought "to suppress all such illumination,"¹ claiming that it was their fault that the British reading public "is not, as a rule, given what it wants to read in its more serious moments, and when it is given what it wants is not usually allowed to read it."² In May, these ideas were extended, as Ford asked for imaginative writers to be treated with respect, since "writing as an art has altogether in Anglo-Saxondom, lost repute."³ This simply repeats Ford's critical views of English culture which were articulated in The English Review and appears to take no account of the post-war Modernist writing with which Ford was familiar. His explanation that readers of novels were still thought of as indulging in some kind of arcane practices, that "in the beginning the power to write - and still more the power of reading - ranked with the Black Arts ... today the last traces of the sentiment attaches to the readers of novels," is not convincing, given the popularity of the novel form;⁴ the general impression is of exaggeration simply for effect.

The attack on the intelligentsia continued in June, when Ford's starting point was the donation of the manuscript of Tennyson's 'Gareth and Lynette' to the Bodleian Library on condition that access was strictly limited. Ford provided a very funny send-up of a variorum edition of the poem, before launching into a strong attack on what he saw as nit-picking scholarship. "It destroys the interest in the works of deceased masters; it constrains the living to strive after an uninterestingness as great as that attaching to the works of masters deceased, after they have been 'attended to' by bibliophiles, text emendators and

¹ Ibid., Apr. 1924, 169.

² Ibid., 173.

³ Ibid., 326.

⁴ Ibid., 321-322.

the rest."¹ He also accused such "scholasticism" of lowering civilised standards of behaviour, an idea repeated in July when he compared the intelligentsia to an army quartermaster who kept all his stores locked up so that the troops were badly equipped and half starved.²

'Stocktaking' was omitted from the August issue by Hemingway. When it resumed in September its target was what Ford called the 'Serious Book' which was a "purveyor of ideas" and which Ford disliked because they were fashionable and therefore became rapidly out of date. Much of the article was devoted to demonstrating, by means of anecdote, exactly why he thought "all Views become ... tripe,"³ though this didn't stop him expressing his own political views vehemently elsewhere in the review. The topic was resumed in October, together with a discussion of style which Ford believed "should be as clear and as simple as is consonant with the subject treated."⁴ Again, not all Ford's own writing in the review satisfies this criteria. The final 'Stocktaking' in November was about readers, and they, like writers, were divided into those who wanted contact with life and those who spurned it; Ford, of course, sided with the first group.

I am for the banjo against the lyre all the time; for that is to say the natural man with appetites, desires, physical aptitudes, carelessnesses and interests in life; as against the Professorial Figure that stands for uninspired industry, career makings and circumspection: I desire that is to say that things should be written, not written about.⁵

'Stocktaking' covers many of Ford's literary hobby horses, but there are no new ideas

¹ Ibid., June 1924, 452.

² Ibid., July, 64-65.

³ Ibid., Sep. 1924, 277.

⁴ Ibid., Oct. 1924, 398.

⁵ Ibid., Nov. 510.

expressed here. Certainly he is consistent in his enthusiasm for good, accessible writing, his anxieties about British culture and his dislike of the intelligentsia, but the repetition of well aired views is another example of Ford apparently unable to move himself forward from The English Review.

His political views, expressed in 'Chroniques', do not simply remain the same as those expressed fifteen years earlier, but have become hardened into prejudice and even paranoia. His dislike of the party political system remained as strong as ever, but his hatred of the Left in British politics was now almost hysterical. He claimed to be politically impartial in his February editorial, but went on to accuse the Left of responsibility both for the Great War and for the war to come because of its pacifist tendencies. He also accused the Left of wanting to restore Prussian industrialism, and of misplaced idealism, which he described as "the finer, more impracticable ideals of the Lefts of the world - those strains from the fiddle of Nero while Rome burns."¹ This was a theme he returned to in March, attacking the foreign policy of the British Left, which mediated between France and Germany over war reparations and the re-establishment of national boundaries, as one which could "only spell world disaster." Here, he admitted to propagandising, though "in the interest of arts and tranquillity" and prayed that "the reign of the British Left should only be a short breather ... If there is a bright spot on the horizon it would lie in the fact that the domination of the present Labour party will be a short one."²

Ford never disguised his old fashioned Toryism; indeed he proclaimed it in the review's prospectus: "The politics will be those of its editor who has no party leanings save towards

¹ Ibid., Feb. 1924, 73.

² Ibid., Mar. 1924, 62-63.

those of a Tory kind so fantastically old-fashioned as to see no salvation save in the feudal system as practised in the fourteenth century - or in such Communism as may prevail a thousand years hence."¹ The Communism is placed so far into the future as to be unimaginable, even inconceivable. The benevolent Toryism was an essential feature in his creation of the characters of Christopher and Mark Tietjens in the Parade's End novels which he was writing at the same time, but the virulence of his attacks on the British Left in the first three issues of The Transatlantic Review was quite startling.² Not only are these opinions in marked contrast to the democratic nature of his literary attitudes, but they seem glaringly out of place in a review which was much more single mindedly concerned with cultural matters than The English Review, and which claimed simply to see international politics as an adjunct to the internationality of letters. Ford may have realised this for himself; in April he announced: "We do not treat of political economy ... We are here to put before the world a picture of the world's real mental activities which are centred in the world's imaginative arts."³ There were no more political diatribes.

The editorial policy of The Transatlantic Review seems flawed on at least three counts. Firstly, there is uncertainty about what it was trying to achieve in that it appeared both to try to replicate some of the ideals and practices of The English Review, while at the same

¹ Prospectus, in South Lodge, p.145.

² Max Saunders has objected that Ford was attacking the Left because he felt that English writers were too routinely attracted to the left, and certainly Ford was not in sympathy with the views of the Bloomsbury writers. But this isn't the basis of his attacks on the British Left in The Transatlantic Review; here his criticism is that left wing politicians are responsible both for past wars and for wars not yet fought.

³ Transatlantic Review, Apr. 1924, 196.

time engaging with some aspects of contemporary and international cultural practice.¹ Secondly, there was an inconsistency even between its stated aims and the actual process of selection of contributions, and much of the editorial process seems to have been unconsidered, even careless. Finally, its literary contents became increasingly unbalanced; the 'transatlantic' part of its title should perhaps more accurately have read 'American'.²

¹ Max Saunders argues that Ford is being flexible rather than inconsistent in wanting both to replicate the policies of *The English Review* and to break new ground. Flexibility implies a policy that is both clear and considered, but this thesis tries to show that Ford's policy was muddled and incoherent, and that his practice as an editor was frequently not based on clearly articulated principles, but on what he could get away with in terms of available contributions and limited editorial time.

² Max Saunders suggests that the 'Americanisation' of the review was Ford's honest response to his belief that the most important writing being done in any of the three review countries was American. Certainly Ford was an admirer of many aspects of American culture, and indeed chose to spend a great part of the last decade of his life in the United States. However, this thesis argues that Ford was simply overwhelmed by the volume of American contributions which he received and chose to include them, or allowed Hemingway to include them, as an easy option. The thesis also points to significant omissions of English and French writers, omissions which might have been overcome had Ford devoted more time and energy to soliciting such contributions. Saunders also argues that this 'Americanisation' does not render the tri-national scheme redundant, but reconceptualizes it. This is being wise after the event. Ford wasn't doing anything as coherent as 'reconceptualising'; all too often, he was making it up as he went along. Additionally, as Chapter 9 has shown, Ford was not the only editor, either in Paris or London or the United States trying to introduce the writers of the three nations to each other, and some were rather more effective at doing this than Ford was.

Chapter 12 The Cultural Contents of The Transatlantic Review

Poetry

Unlike The English Review, The Transatlantic Review did not discover any major new poets, although it did publish work by established poets, such as Bryher, Mary Butts, A.E. Coppard, e.e.cummings, H.D., F.S.Flint, Mina Loy, Ezra Pound, Evan Shipman and William Carlos Williams. Ford was following trends rather than leading here, since all these poets appeared regularly in other journals, such as The Little Review, Dial and Broom, and two of them - Pound and Flint - had also appeared in The English Review under Ford. There was no longer anything startling or original about their poetry, though the range of subjects and styles was extensive. The promise shown in the first issue, which began with four poems by cummings, Coppard's 'Pelagea' and 'Two Cantos' by Pound, was not sustained, and Ford himself disliked some of the poetry which appeared in the review, such as the twelve poems of R.C.Dunning, which were included in the November issue at Pound's insistence. Too much of the poetry failed to meet Ford's own criteria of excellence. The poems by D.M.Garman, for example, with portentous titles such as 'Expectancy', 'Coherence' and 'Absence', which appeared in June, were the kind of heavily literary poetry which Ford deplored, while the poems by Baronin Elsa Van Freytag-Loringhoven which Hemingway pushed into the August issue in Ford's absence, were so obscure that they failed to communicate anything at all. French poetry was represented by the work of Jacques Baron in April, Georges Ribement in June and Tristan Tzara in December. There was nothing by Yeats or Eliot or Ford himself.

Prose: Fiction

The prose fiction in the review was far more interesting, varied and innovative than the poetry. Part One of Ford's Some Do Not was serialised in every number except August,

when Hemingway deliberately omitted it, October, and December, when it was discontinued, probably because the novel was available in both the United Kingdom and the United States,¹ and because Ford knew the review would fold. Some Do Not marked the full return of Ford's powers as a novelist and also his confidence in himself as a writer, which had evaporated in the post-war years, and which had only partly returned with the publication of The Marsden Case in 1923. Obviously, serialisation in the review was a form of free advertisement for Ford, but he also included it as part of his policy to provide extracts which would allow the reader to judge a book and its writer. "It has been our settled policy from the first to print fragments of work in progress almost in preference to complete works."² The 'fragment' from his novel shows both Ford's extreme technical competence and his ability to engage with contemporary issues such as the breakdown of traditional values and the part played by the Great War in this breakdown. It was also the first of many fictional reconstructions of the impact of the war by a writer who had first hand experience of serving in the armed forces in France.

The other large scale prose fiction, included in the review, (apart from the collaborative The Nature of a Crime, which had already appeared in The English Review) was Gertrude Stein's The Making of Americans; this was serialised from April to December. The work had been written in the first decade of the century, and it was Hemingway who persuaded Stein to agree to it being published by the review, though he seems to have misled Ford about its length. Subtitled 'Being the History of a Family's Progress', it traced the interconnections between the old world and the new as a family establishes itself in America. "It has always seemed to me a rare privilege, this, of being an American a real

¹ Harvey estimates the dates of publication to be April 1924 in London and October 1924 in New York, Harvey, pp.58-59.

²Transatlantic Review, Nov. 1924, 551.

American, one whose tradition has taken scarcely sixty years to create ...The old people in a new world, the new people made out of the old world, that is the story I mean to tell."¹ Like Ford, Stein was adept at digression, though her sentences far exceed in length any which Ford ever produced. She described her method:

Bear it in your mind my reader, but truly I never feel it that there ever can be for me any such creature, no it is this scribbled and dirty and lined paper that is really to be to me my receiver - but anyhow reader, bear it in your mind - will there be for me ever any such creature - what I have always said before to you, that this I write down a little each day here on my scraps of paper for you is not just an ordinary kind of novel with a plot and conversation to amuse you, but a record of a decent family progress respectably lived by us and our fathers and mothers, and our grandfathers and grandmothers, and this is by me carefully a little each day to be written down here...²

The sentence goes on for as long again! The voice is quite distinctive, apparently casual, colloquial and intimate, as well as rambling and repetitive, yet never quite surrendering its control, though its effect over long expanses is irritating rather than illuminating. Stein herself admitted that although the work had felt fine while she was writing it, she did now wonder how anyone could read it.³ Stein was a force to be reckoned with in the world of Paris literary and artistic salons, and the publication of a major work by her gave the review a certain prestige.

From Ford's point of view, the greatest coup for the review was securing the Mamalujo episode of Finnegan's Wake which appeared in the Literary Supplement in April. Since the publication of Ulysses by Sylvia Beach in 1922, the reputation of James Joyce had been extremely high with both English-speaking and French readers. Joyce had refused to give any work to The Criterion, so Ford's achievement in extracting work from Joyce was

¹ Ibid., Apr. 1924, 127.

² Ibid., 27.

³ Humphrey Carpenter, Geniuses Together: American Writers in Paris in the 1920s (London: 1987), p.198.

impressive, even though the two men were on excellent terms and met regularly during the career of the review. Eliot benefitted in the long run, since further extracts from Finnegan's Wake did appear in The Criterion in April 1925.

The fiction for which The Transatlantic Review is best known is its short stories. The largest proportion of these were by American writers, and Ford identified their distinguishing characteristics; "They get their atmosphere with an extreme economy of method which is alien indeed to the as if dispassionate formlessness of the ... English short story writers."¹ Many of the American stories were terse low key narratives of American rural life, for example, Robert McAlmon's 'Elsie' in January about a maid from an orphanage, and Kennon Jewitt's 'Running Away' in June, about a protagonist who runs away from home as a boy, as an adolescent and as a young man and who fails to return on the last occasion. Ivan Beede's 'A Prairie Summer Morning' in July was a savage account of the cruelty of one farm servant to another, while his 'Calico' in December told of a farmer's wife who scrimps and saves to acquire wealth and status, and who cannot cope when she has them. Other American stories examined the effect of city life on the individual: Carlos Drake's 'Surcease' in March tells of a clerk trapped in a monotonous office routine, whose one gesture of defiance is to scream in a restaurant, while Nathan Asch's 'Voice of the Office' in June is an unpunctuated record of the sounds in an office during a day's business. Asch also provided the depressing story of 'Gertrude Donovan', a redundant typist, in December. The review published three of Hemingway's 'Nick' stories in April, November and December, and two stories by Djuna Barnes, both about French women and set in France, in April and November.

¹ Transatlantic Review, Mar.1924, 63.

This represents only some of the American short stories in the review, but does give some indication of their diversity. In fact, some of the most impressive writing is by English authors, the longest and the most moving being A.E.Coppard's 'The Higgler' in the May issue. This is a poignant story of misplaced love in a rural setting reminiscent of Hardy in subject matter if not in style. The range of the English writers' contributions can be demonstrated by reference to B.M.G.Adams' 'Uncle Bertram' in March, with its veiled hints of child molesting, to two stories by Catherine Wells in May and November about the suppressed emotional lives of the upper classes, to Dorothy Richardson's 'The Garden', which Hemingway included in the August number, to D.M.Garman's 'Visiting Day' in September which graphically tells of a grocer visiting his wife in hospital on a Sunday to be told she is dying of cancer, to A.W.Ellis' 'London Night' in the last issue which recorded conversation overheard at a London bus stop and on the bus itself. In the same month, the review published self contained cryptic and melancholy extracts from Jean Rhys' novel. Triple Sec. There was surprisingly little French fiction in the review, only Jean Cassou's 'Concorde' in the first number, two 'comte rendu' by Pierre Hamp in March, Paul Morand's 'L'Enfant de Cent Ans' in May and 'Le Conte du Bon et du Mauvais Ouvriers' by André Wurmser in October. There was a Swedish fairy story, in translation, by Selma Lagerhof, in March and a very short story by Geoffrey Coulter, 'The Decoy', about the troubles in Ireland in October. Most of these stories accord with Ford's belief that literature should be concerned with the life we lead, and should use language economically and precisely. Certainly their overall standard is very high, showing that for this category of writing at least, Ford's judgement had not deserted him.

Other Prose

The most substantial prose item was the Memories of Luke Ionides, which ran, with the exception of the August issue, from January to October. They were prompted by the

discovery of some letters written to the author at least a century ago by correspondents long since dead. His children and friends encouraged him to write down the memories of some of these friends, but what might have been interesting as a series of spoken recollections becomes rather flat and tedious when recorded in print. Certainly his list of friends and acquaintances is impressive - Whistler, Gilbert, Burne Jones, D.G. Rossetti, William Morris, Garibaldi - but the recollections appear random and unco-ordinated, and the rather flat prose into which Dorothy Shakespeare transcribed them, does not make for compelling reading. The anecdotal method of narration may have appealed to Ford, and some of the figures described by Ionides were known to him as a child, but the Memories sit uncomfortably in a cultural journal which in other ways was trying to address the contemporary world.

Drama was briefly represented by two short plays, in French, by George Pillement. The first, 'Ah! Que d'Amour Gache sans Profit pour Personne' was set in a bar, and because it dealt with pimps and prostitutes caused the review to be accused of indecency by the American Women's Club in Paris. The second, 'L'Amour est mon Cercueil - Prologue et Epilogue' was similar in character, dealing with Paris street life. Ford may have felt that they captured something of contemporary café life, and as such, complemented the comments on cultural life in each of the three countries in which the review was published. These appeared as part of the 'Chroniques' section and were frequently in the form of a letter. For example, the Paris letter in the first issue was a melancholy description of Mallarmé's house outside Paris, written by Phillipe Soupault, while the American letter, by Jeanne Foster, was addressed to Americans visiting Paris for the first time and listed galleries showing modern art. In March, 'Lettre du Paris' was an article by Jean Cassou on 'Un Poete Espagnol Contemporain - Antonio Machado', that in June was by Alain Fournier on 'Bernardin de St. Pierre et le Cubisme' and in July André Salmon

wrote on trends in contemporary French literature. 'And From the United States' was written by Harold Stearns in March, by Kennon Jewitt in April and by Hemingway in May and July, the first attacking critics and offering a spoof gossip column and the second attacking Cocteau and providing a very funny send-up of a Dada-ist playlet. His Pamplona letter in September was not about Pamplona at all, but about not wanting to write a Pamplona letter. Ford himself wrote the American letter for August based on impressions during his own recent trip to the States, and in November he also wrote the Paris letter which included a tribute to Anatole France. Poli suggests that Ford may also have been the author of the last American letter in December and this is not impossible.¹ It purports to be written by Elizabeth Krebs, which is perhaps a mocking reference to Krebs Friend and his wife Elizabeth, whose money had financed the review through its last months, but it is a parody of both the subject matter and the style of a mid western short story. Other overseas letters came from Belgium, Czechoslovakia and Ireland; Geoffrey Coulter, who had been introduced to Ford by his daughter Katharine, provided three 'Litir o Eirinn' from Dublin.

The 'Communications' section of the review served a number of purposes, including self publicity, the exchange of ideas and an outlet for anger. So it was here that Ford placed the letters of good wishes for the review from Conrad, Wells, Eliot and Florence Hardy. Eliot endorsed both Ford's view that "the standards of literature should be international" and his Toryism, but argued that there was no need to discriminate in favour of younger writers. "The use of a review is not to force talent, but to create a favourable atmosphere."² It was in this section in June that Ford placed a carefully edited version of Ezra Pound's

¹ Poli, p.129.

² Transatlantic Review, Jan. 1924, 95-96.

letter about the review, colloquialisms, idiosyncratic spellings and all, adding lest his readers should be incredulous, that "the above by the way is a real letter."¹ Sometimes Ford wrote in this section in reply to information received, for example, in February and March, about H.M. Customs seizing books allegedly containing obscene material. In March he also printed William Bird's beliefs about copywriting laws not helping authors. In May, using the anagram of R. Edison Page, Edgar Jepson, a friend of Ford's from The English Review days, wrote a letter to the editor saying that there were only four important novelists currently writing for English readers - Conrad, Ford Madox Ford, Norman Douglas and H.G. Wells. Since three of these were then dismissed for dreariness, the writer was forced to conclude that "the one recent novel of vigour and charm and truth to English life is..." The reader, of course, was intended to supply the title of Some Do Not.² Pound wrote in March to defend ideas which had appeared in the first music supplement. William Carlos Williams sent letters, endorsed by Ford, praising the prose of Robert McAlmon, and Mina Loy wrote two letters both explaining and admiring the prose style of Gertrude Stein.³ Angry letters included Tzara's refutation of Hemingway's charge that he couldn't translate from French into English in September, and, in November, George Antheil's defence of his music against Hemingway's accusation that it was pseudo Stravinsky in style. Some communications were very lighthearted, such as the dramatic monologue 'L'Independant' almost certainly by Pound and Ford, which poked fun at the art establishment, in April, the letter apparently from a student at Stoneyhurst College, complaining that the review was boring and contained "verbiage like steaming dung," and

¹ Ibid., June 1924, 480.

² Ibid., May 1924, 365.

³ Ibid., May, Aug. and Sep., Oct. 1924, respectively.

offering an article on sex,¹ and a very funny account of Paris fashions - which writer and artist was wearing what - by Marjorie Reid, the review's advertising manager, in November. 'Communications' was undoubtedly something of a rag bag, but it was lively and entertaining, suggesting that however confused the review might be about its contents policy, there was some kind of community of writers and readers who did at least read it.

Supplements

One of the most obvious differences between The English Review and The Transatlantic Review was the greater coverage which the latter gave to art and music, although multi-disciplinary cultural journals were much commoner in 1924 than in 1909. By the twenties, there were numerous precedents for the inclusion of art work and musical scores in cultural journals; Art and Letters, Broom, The Chapbook, Coterie and The Golden Hind contained art and literature, The Criterion contained literature and occasional music while The Little Review and Action contained all three. In any case, in Paris in 1924, it would have been difficult for a wide ranging review to ignore them. The fact that art and music were entirely confined to supplements might suggest some kind of marginalisation, were it not that The Transatlantic Review also published three literature supplements. The rationale for these is hard to find since all the work published in them could quite easily have gone into the body of the review; the only exception to this was the Conrad supplement in September which had a unity of focus which was lacking in the other literature supplements.

Ford seems to have taken entire responsibility for the literary supplements and to have kept

¹ Ibid., Sep. 1924, 310.

them free from interference from Hemingway. The first literary supplement, in April, appeared largely as a vehicle for the extract from Finnegan's Wake which was in a section called 'Work in Progress'; Joyce liked this title so much that he kept it until the complete work was published in 1939. Also in the same section was a Dada-ist text, 'Monsieur Aa L'Antiphilosophie - Quatre Fragments', by Tristan Tzara, and one of Hemingway's 'Nick' stories. The juxtaposition of these works showed the range of work being produced in Paris by writers from three very different cultural backgrounds. The second literary supplement in July, this time called 'Fragments from Work in Progress or to Appear' was altogether a more pedestrian affair, containing details from Ford and Conrad about how they had collaborated on The Nature of a Crime, which had just appeared in book form, two of Jean Cocteau's 'Philosophies' and an extract from Donald Stewart's novel John Brown's Body. The placing of all this material in a supplement seems arbitrary, and suggests a lack of planning and an incoherent editorial policy for the arrangement of literary contributions.

The September literary supplement was entirely devoted to Conrad, who had died the previous month. His death for Ford marked "the end of a whole literary phase"¹ and he postponed the art supplement which had been planned, to include six obituaries, including his own 'C'est Toi Qui Dors Dans L'Ombre'. Ford assembled these very quickly, using whatever writers he could find in Paris in August, but unfortunately, they were not, with the exception of Ford himself, Conrad admirers, and their efforts range from the tentative and ill-informed to the vitriolic. Robert McAlmon admitted his own lack of enthusiasm for Conrad, but conceded that "he had an intelligence which commands respect."² Hemingway's response, already referred to, was the most hostile. Ford's testament, which

¹ Ibid., Sep. 297.

² Ibid., 344.

became the first part of Joseph Conrad: A Personal Remembrance was an affectionate recollection of his long association with Conrad, though this led to accusations that "the glory which was Conrad's appeared but a reflection of Ford's glory."¹ In his portrait, Ford deliberately adopted the techniques of novel writing; his tribute to Conrad was

a projection of Joseph Conrad as, little by little, he revealed himself to a human being during many years of intimacy. It is so that, by degrees, Lord Jim appears to Marlowe ... For according to our view of the thing, a novel should be the biography of a man or of an affair and a biography whether of a man or of an affair should be a novel, both being, if they are efficiently performed, renderings of such affairs as are our human lives.²

The last literary supplement in October contained the next instalment of Portrait, a section called 'Paris Verse' by Eyre de Lanux, Natalie Barney and Nancy Cunard, who were all Paris residents, a short essay on the state of American literary affairs by Glenway Westcott and an article by Neil Forbes Grant on the need for topicality in drama. The last two instalments of Portrait were simply placed at the end of the November and December issues, providing further evidence of a lack of consistency over the location of prose writings in the review.

The musical supplements of the review were largely the responsibility of Ezra Pound who was going through a phase of fancying himself both as a composer and as a bassoon player; the score of some of his 'fiddle music' appeared in the August supplement. The major item in the first three supplements in February, May and August was 'Notes for Performers' by William Atheling, alias Pound, with 'Marginalia emitted by George Antheil'. Antheil, a young American concert pianist and enthusiast for the works of Stravinsky, was much better qualified to write about music than Pound and was embarrassed by Pound's patronage. "From the first day I met him Ezra was never to have even the slightest idea

¹ Robert McAlmon, Being Geniuses Together (London: 1938), pp.169-170.

²Transatlantic Review, Sep. 1924, 337.

of what I was really up to in music ... he merely wanted to use me as a whip with which to lash out at all those who disagreed with him"¹ Because he was associated with *avant garde* music making in Paris, Antheil felt that Pound was completely out of touch. He allowed Pound to print the score of his Sonata 3, which had no time or key signatures, and wrote a couple of articles for the review, including one on Fanelli which he himself described as "wishy washy."² Otherwise he wished to dissociate himself from Pound's efforts on his behalf. It is difficult now to take Pound's musical pretensions too seriously, but Ford was not alone in believing that Pound had interesting things to say about music. The New Age published Pound's music reviewing under the name William Atheling from 1917 to 1920, and The Criterion published his commentary on the music of Antheil in April 1924.

The most thoughtful part of the music supplements was Dyneley Hussey's 'Music in London', which provided wide ranging surveys of the kind of music being performed in London, together with scathing criticisms of London audiences. "My real point is to emphasize the hopeless apathy of the London public which will justify no enterprise on the part of concert goers or impresarios."³ As if to push this point home, Hussey's contribution was followed by Henrietta Malkiel's survey of music in New York which outlined the acceptance of jazz and reviewed Gershwin's 'Rhapsody in Blue' as "a work of distinct promise."⁴ The score of a short song composed by the distinguished elderly composer, Eric Satie, appeared in the May supplement. The big omission was any coverage

¹ George Antheil, Bad Boy of Music (London: 1947), pp.97-98.

² Ibid., p.106.

³ Transatlantic Review, Aug. 1924, 228-229.

⁴ Ibid., 231.

of the contemporary musical scene in Paris.

The art supplements, in March and June, included black and white reproductions of work by Brancusi, Braque, Gwen John, Cedric Morris, Man Ray, Nina Hamnett and Picasso, together with two woodcuts by Latapie and photographs of several sculptures by John Storrs; the advertisement at the front of the September issue claimed that the Brancusi drawings were made specially for the review and that the Picassos were "of a type never before reproduced." The Brancusi work *was* new, but the Picasso sketches had been drawn between 1903 and 1907, and were from Gertrude Stein's extensive modern art collection; there was a note saying that she had allowed the review "to print some specimens of the innumerable drawings with which M. Picasso exercises himself for his more esoteric works."¹

The two supplements also carried articles on art. The March supplement had 'Notes sur L'Art de Braque' by Bissière, 'Art in Modern Germany' about German expressionism and constructivism, by Boski Markins, and a list of London art exhibitions in the winter of 1923-4, assembled by Anthony Bertram of The Spectator. In June, R.H. Wilenski provided a London Art Chronicle, which referred to the invigorating effect of the Bloomsbury artists and also singled out Wynham Lewis for special emphasis; "The crucial artist is, of course, Wyndham Lewis, whose agile mind reacts to a hundred facets of contemporary life."² Juan Gris, whom Ford had recently met, contributed an article, 'Des possibilités de la Peinture', which had been delivered as a lecture at the Sorbonne on May 15; the second half of this appeared in July. The supplement ended with a letter from John Sandford about the

¹ Ibid., June 1924, 472.

² Ibid., 488.

difficulties faced by contemporary artists. "If the standard has fallen, the fault lies with conditions of production rather than with the producer",¹ which echoed Ford's own views on the conditions of literary production expressed in 'Stocktaking'.

There was also an interesting, albeit small publicity exercise launched, which was linked to the art work of the review. In May, there was an announcement that a subscriber, unnamed, had paid for a number of copies to be given free "to such practising artists as are really unable to afford francs 7.50." Such artists were asked to apply to the editor "by letter marked 'Private'."² The subscriber may have been Gertrude Stein in gratitude for seeing her The Making of Americans in print in the previous month's review; she was certainly wealthy enough and had allowed a few items from her extensive art collection to be reproduced in the review. This identity cannot be confirmed, however, and there is no information about the take up rate for this offer!

It is difficult to establish who was responsible for the art in The Transatlantic Review. In a letter to Jeanne Foster, thanking her for her Paris letter with its guide to art galleries, Ford teasingly told her that she was "a wicked woman to butt into the art criticism of the TR; but, you being a weak and clinging woman Ezra may not break your neck."³ This suggests that Pound had a hand in the art contents, but Foster, through her long friendship with Quinn and her familiarity with his art acquisitions, had an extensive knowledge of the contemporary art world and was well placed to offer advice. Nina Hamnett, described as

¹ Ibid., 493.

² Ibid., May 1924, 351.

³ Ford to Jeanne Foster, Nov. 18, 1923, Ford-Foster Friendship, 185.

"the best known British woman painter in Paris",¹ was a close friend of both Ford and Stella during their Paris years; she helped them find their studio in Notre Dame des Champs, and they bought some of her drawings, and she may well have been involved. The cover of the September review gives Stella's full name, Esther G. Bowen, as the Assistant Art Editor, and certainly Stella was painting and exhibiting in Paris during The Transatlantic Review period. Her own work, largely portraits, was not experimental or *avant garde*, but she and Ford had contacts with the experimental and *avant garde* art world, particularly through their friendship with Juan Gris and his wife. Although the review did produce work by outstanding contemporary artists, all of them had been extensively, and often more excitingly, reproduced in other cultural journals, so that again, The Transatlantic Review was following rather than setting trends. The quality of the reproductions, too, is disappointing, and the small pages of the review fail to do justice to some of the larger paintings, such as those by Braque. Given the contacts available to him, Ford could have produced really stunning art supplements; his failure to do so may have been as much due to the constraints of time and money, as to his belief in the primacy of the written word.

The Achievement of The Transatlantic Review

Although Ford lost a great deal of money on The Transatlantic Review, and although its business affairs had generated a great deal of hard work for him, he was able to reconcile himself to its collapse much more easily than to his loss of control of The English Review. This was partly because the review ceased to be published so that Ford was not faced with the prospect of watching a review which he had founded, and from which he

¹ Denise Hooker, Nina Hamnett: Queen of Bohemia (London: 1986), p.150.

had effectively been sacked, being run by someone else along lines which were not to his liking. In fact, given the state of The Transatlantic Review's finances, its closure may actually have been a relief. Ford also had the prospect of continuing good creative work of his own; as he explained to Monroe Wheeler, an American art student and critic, on the first day of 1925, "I must for the moment take some time off to do some writing of my own."¹

Ford was also able to relinquish the review because he seems to have felt that it had achieved its aims. The last editorial, dated Armistice Day, 1924, is both careful and complacent in the claims it made for the review, careful in that the aims were clearly set out, complacent in that the tone of the whole editorial is one of pleasure in a job well done. "Looking back the record seems remarkably satisfactory."² Ford reminded his readers of the two aims of the review; "to promote greater cordiality in international relationships so that the arts might work in a better atmosphere" and "provide a place for publication for such sincere commencing authors as the world might hold."³ He himself felt that the review had done a great deal to promote both a 'movement' and an improvement in international relationships, though he did not substantiate this claim. His tea parties and dances undoubtedly allowed a great deal of international socialising to take place but whether the review itself improved the 'cordiality' of international relations is very much open to question. It did provide a place where younger American writers could appear alongside acknowledged older writers such as Joyce, Pound and himself, though it is doubtful whether publication in it made any difference to the writing careers of any of its

¹ Ford to Monroe Wheeler, Jan. 1, 1925, Ludwig, p.164.

² Transatlantic Review, Dec. 1924, 683.

³ Ibid., 684.

contributors. Joyce's reputation was already made, Hemingway had already appeared in print and was, in any case, an aggressive self-publicist. Only Jean Rhys owes her career as a writer to Ford's interest in her and his willingness to include brief fragments of her writing in the last issue of the review, as she later acknowledged: "When it came to writing he was a very generous man and he encouraged me a great deal."¹

Ford's claim that the review was the only forum for "a whole body of new creative work ... on a large scale and over a large space of the earth's surface"² does not stand up to scrutiny. While it was the only review to be published in three countries, it was not the only review which was available internationally and which addressed itself to the culture of more than one nation; The Criterion and The Little Review, to name but two, are evidence of this. Nor was The Transatlantic Review the only place where new writers could be published, since new journals were started in all three countries associated with it, both before, during and after its brief career, many of them with the aim of providing just such opportunities.

There were also significant absences from The Transatlantic Review. There were those English Review contributors who wished the new review well, but who offered no new contribution to it; these included H.G.Wells and Thomas Hardy. Conrad's contribution was reluctant and minimal. There were those English Review contributors, who either refused to contribute, such as Wyndham Lewis and W.B.Yeats, and those who were not asked to contribute, such as D.H.Lawrence, E.M.Forster and Arnold Bennett. More significant than either group were the absences of leading intellectual figures in both the Paris and London

¹ Jean Rhys in Gould transcript, p.3.

² Transatlantic Review, June 1924, 472.

cultural worlds; in Paris, these included André Gide, André Breton, Louis Aragon and Valéry Larbaud, and in London, T.S.Eliot, (apart from his introductory letter) and a whole range of writers associated with Bloomsbury. American writers were far better represented, largely because so many of them were in Paris in 1924. There was nothing, however, from Sherwood Anderson, William Faulkner or John Crowe Ransom, all of whom had appeared in The Double Dealer, or from Marianne Moore or Wallace Stevens, who had been published in Broom, perhaps because Jeanne Foster, Ford's contact in New York, was far more familiar with the world of contemporary art than contemporary poetry.

Quite clearly no one journal could hope to incorporate all contemporary writing and these omissions do not reflect ignorance on Ford's part, since his own very extensive network of contacts would have kept him in touch with who was writing what and where. There simply isn't the evidence to show how far Ford made policy decisions on who to include and who to omit from the review, though the vagaries of the review's career suggest that for much of the time he was making it up as he went along. He may have recognised this; in the April 'Chroniques' section, he defended the review against the accusation that it was a miscellany, but the fact that he needed to make the defence at all, suggests that he wasn't entirely at ease on the subject.¹ The Transatlantic Review was less comprehensive than The English Review. It made no mention of the French elections and the consequent change of government, no mention of the Olympics which were held in Paris that summer, and no mention of such cultural events as the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo's new season with costumes by Juan Gris, or Jean Cocteau's Romeo and Juliet, which was performed in Paris that year. It provided an insight into *some* international artistic activities, but as the proportion of American writing increased, it became unbalanced.

¹ Ibid., Apr. 1924, 196.

Within these limitations, the review was an interesting and lively enterprise in which a genuine cultural exchange took place. It managed to strike a note which was neither highbrow nor anarchic; despite Ford's cultural and political diatribes, his review was neither as solemn and humourless as The Criterion nor as iconoclastic as Littérature. Additionally, it managed to suggest that both creativity and running a cultural journal could be fun, an impression which is confirmed by Ford's humorous account of it in It Was The Nightingale. The review contained several spoofs and send-ups and even the advertisements section indulged in a little leg-pulling. In March and April, there were illustrations of Victorian Gentlemen's shirts and ladies' fashions, under the headings 'Ford's Eureka Shirts' and 'Ford's Fashions'. These were reproduced from the third number of The Cornhill Magazine under Thackeray, Ford having promised himself that "if ever we again direct a periodical, if there were no other advertisements, [these] should decorate its pages."¹

Contemporary opinion was guarded and qualified. Sisley Huddleston thought that the review "was an interesting if unequal publication" and described some of its contributors as being "like the little girl who had a little curl right in the middle of her forehead."² Samuel Putnam praised it for giving "impulse to a new and vital literary movement", but described this movement solely in terms of bringing American writing to Europe.³ McAlmon and Hemingway sneered at the review and its editor, and Nathan Asch was one of the very few younger contributors who was open in his praise of Ford, both as an editor

¹ Ibid., May, 1924, 360.

² Bohemian Life, p. 143.

³ Paris was our Mistress, p.70.

and as a supporter of new talent. "He was a great editor, the greatest I have ever known."¹

The Transatlantic Review was neither as radical nor as successful as Ford's earlier editorial venture. Krickel argues that it "could hardly seem as good ... because it functioned in a context of values which Ford had pioneered."² The 'values which Ford had pioneered' may be one yardstick by which the achievement of The Transatlantic Review can and should be measured; this will inevitably lessen the impact of the later venture. In any case, such a judgement takes no account of the very different world in which the later review was produced. There are other reasons why The Transatlantic Review was a lesser achievement. It was less crusading and less innovative, too often recycling English Review ideas and material, it was produced in a wholly different set of cultural circumstances for which Ford did not make full allowance, it was a less important part of Ford's own creative career than The English Review had been and his commitment to it was not as great. To a far greater extent than with The English Review Ford appeared to take little account of developments in contemporary cultural journalism, so that his second editorial venture seems frequently to be old fashioned and out of touch.

¹ Cited in Poli, p.141.

² Edward Krickel, 'Lord Plushbottom in the Service of the Kingdom', in The Presence of Ford Madox Ford, p.105.

Conclusion

The introduction to this study proposed three fields of enquiry by which the achievement of an editor might be assessed. The first of these was to consider how far Ford's editorial practice was consistent with his own literary and critical principles. With two significant exceptions, Ford is remarkably consistent. His belief in the community of letters and in literature as a civilizing force, his delight in discovering and encouraging new writers and his missionary zeal in promoting older ones, his dislike of commercialism and the academic establishment, his conviction that literature should engage with the life we lead and should speak to the reader in a quiet, almost colloquial voice, together with a great charity in his own literary judgements, are all central to the editorial policy of both reviews and inform his editorials and his choice of contents. The exceptions are, firstly, that while he felt strongly that poetry was "too much practised in temples and too little in motor buses - LITERARY! LITERARY!"¹, too much of the poetry included in both reviews is precisely that. Secondly, while he deplored moralizing in literature, he used the editorial sections of both reviews to harangue his readers about his own beliefs; in the case of The Transatlantic Review, the tone of these harangues is too often strident.

The second field of enquiry, which has formed a major part of this study, was a comparison between the reviews edited by Ford and other contemporary cultural journals, and this has produced the most surprising results, showing that the generally held view of Ford as a truly great editor could indeed be challenged. Ford had access to a wide range of impressive and often innovative cultural journalism, such as The Yellow Book and The Savoy from the late Victorian period, and The Monthly Review and The New Age from

¹ Ford to Lucy Masterman, Jan. 23, 1912, cited in MacShane, p.97.

his own, which provided precedents for some of the innovations and changes which Ford wanted to make. There were also a number of contemporary periodicals, both monthly and weekly, providing consistently intelligent commentary on Edwardian cultural, social and political life. Contemporary cultural journalism simply was not as moribund as Ford and Bennett claimed, and Malcolm Bradbury is incorrect in his assertion that only Ford's journal took literature seriously.¹ The English Review was not some kind of review arising out of a journalistic vacuum; rather, it flourished in a society which offered a wide range of cultural journalism. Neither was it the purely cultural journal which some observers suppose; it gave little coverage of contemporary art and music, while offering the kind of general political and social commentary which could be found in most high quality journals of the day. Additionally, Ford was notoriously inept in his management of the review's affairs, and particularly of its finances, and in this sense, he compares unfavourably with other contemporary editors, most notably Orage. This study does not seek to belittle the achievements of The English Review under Ford, but argues that it was less of a beacon in the imagined gloom of Edwardian cultural journalism than is generally supposed.

The Transatlantic Review detracts more seriously from Ford's reputation as a brilliant editor. The cultural setting in which it was produced was very different from that which produced The English Review, and cultural journalism itself had also changed fairly dramatically in the intervening years. Ford had a far wider range of models on which to base his new project. There was the *avant-garde*, in the form of Blast, Dada and Littérature. There were the avowedly international journals such as The Anglo-French Review, Coterie, Broom and The Criterion. There was a whole range of cultural journalism from three nations, some long standing such as La Nouvelle Revue Française and The

¹ Malcolm Bradbury, 'The English Review', The London Magazine, v., Aug. 1958, 46.

Little Review, and others, such as Tyro, which had very brief lives. This study concludes that Ford was uncertain about what kind of journal he wanted The Transatlantic Review to be, that the review followed rather than established trends and that therefore both its policies and its contents are muddled and unbalanced. It also concludes that Ford's business and financial mismanagement was even worse than it had been for The English Review, and that it is surprising that it survived for as long as twelve months.

The final field of enquiry, a comparison of the careers, contents and achievements of Ford's two reviews, has produced less surprising results. Ford's own literary and critical principles are shown to be the same in 1924 as they were in 1909, but they are presented with less fervour. The later review is, quite simply, less crusading, though this lessening of editorial commitment is perhaps explained by Ford's increasing preoccupation with and confidence in his own creative writing. It is also a lesser editorial achievement; it may be multi-cultural in intention, but in practice, it is biased towards American prose, as well as being disorganised and inadequately planned.

The overall conclusion is that the conventional wisdom on Ford's achievement as an editor should be revised. This study acknowledges Ford's strengths as an editor; these are his enthusiasm for and commitment to literary causes, his receptivity to new kinds of writing, his wide knowledge of writers both past and present and an enormous capacity for hard work. It concludes, however, that his weaknesses as an editor are greater than is generally allowed. His greatest weakness was his mismanagement of money and people in the running of both reviews, but his capacity for self-dramatisation and self-advertisement, together with his discovery of new literary talent and his lifelong commitment to literary causes, may have led observers to overlook his editorial lapses of judgement, and to take insufficient account of what other editors achieved. Reluctantly but remorselessly, this

study has been forced to concede that while Ford's editorial achievement was considerable and while he may be one of the best known as well as one of the most respected of twentieth century editors, he was not, as Violet Hunt claimed for him, " the greatest editor ... that has ever been."¹

¹ The Flurried Years, p.45.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[A] PRIMARY SOURCES

Works by Ford: Fiction

Note: Many of Ford's works were published both in England and the United States. Where publication was simultaneous, I have given the edition used, but where this was not the first appearance of the book, I have given details both of its first appearance and of the edition used.

The Brown Owl, 3rd edn (London: T.Fisher Unwin, 1892)

The Feather (London: T.Fisher Unwin, 1892)

The Queen Who Flew (London: Bliss, Sands and Foster, 1894)

The Cinque Ports (London: William Blackwood, 1900)

The Benefactor: A Tale of a Small Circle (London: Brown, Langham, 1905)

The Fifth Queen and How She Came to Court (London: Alston Rivers, 1906)

Privy Seal: His Last Venture (London: Alston Rivers, 1907)

The Fifth Queen Crowned: A Romance (London: Eveleigh Nash, 1910)

all repr. as The Fifth Queen (London: Bodley Head, 1962)

An English Girl: A Romance (London: Methuen, 1907)

Christina's Fairy Book (London: Alston Rivers, 1907)

Mr. Apollo: A Just Possible Story (London: Methuen, 1908)

The 'Half Moon': A Romance of the Old World and the New (London: Eveleigh Nash, 1909)

A Call: The Tale of Two Passions (London: Chatto and Windus, 1910)

The Portrait (London: Methuen, 1910)

The Simple Life Limited, [under pseud. Daniel Chaucer] (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1911)

Ladies Whose Bright Eyes: A Romance (London: Constable, 1911)

The Panel: A Sheer Comedy (London: Constable, 1912)

The New Humpty-Dumpty, [under pseud. Daniel Chaucer] (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1912)

Mr. Fleight (London: Howard Latimer, 1913)

The Good Soldier: A Tale of Passion (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1915, reissued Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972, repr. 1982)

The Marsden Case: A Romance (London: Duckworth, 1923)

Some Do Not ... (London: Duckworth, 1924)

No More Parades (London: Duckworth, 1925)

A Man Could Stand Up (London: Duckworth, 1926)

The Last Post (London: Duckworth, 1928)

all repr. as Parade's End (Harmondsworth: Penguin,1982)

The Nature of a Crime, [in collaboration with Joseph Conrad] (London: Duckworth, 1924)

A Little Less Than Gods: A Romance (London: Duckworth, 1928)

When the Wicked Man (New York: Horace Liveright, 1931)

The Rash Act (London: Jonathan Cape, 1933)

Henry for Hugh (Philadelphia: J.B.Lippincott, 1934)

Vive Le Roy (Philadelphia: Lipincott, 1936, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1937)

Works by Ford: Non-Fiction

Ford Madox Brown: A Record of his Life and Work (London: Longmans, Green, 1896)

The Cinque Ports: A Historical and Descriptive Record (London: William Blackwood, 1900)

Rossetti: A Critical Essay on his Art (London: Duckworth, 1902)

Hans Holbein The Younger: A Critical Monograph (London: Duckworth, 1905)

The Soul of London: A Survey of a Modern City (London: Alston Rivers, 1905)

The Heart of the Country: A Survey of a Modern Land (London: Alston Rivers,1906)

The Spirit of the People: An Analysis of the English Mind (London: Alston Rivers, 1907)

all republished in one volume as England and the English: An Interpretation (New York: McClure, Phillips, 1907)

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood: A Critical Monograph (London: Duckworth, 1907)

Ancient Lights and Certain New Reflections (London: Chapman and Hall: 1911)

The Critical Attitude London: Duckworth: 1911)

Henry James: A Critical Study (London: Martin Secker, 1914)

When Blood is Their Argument: An Analysis of Prussian Culture (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915)

Between St. Dennis and St. George: A Sketch of Three Civilisations (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915)

Thus to Revisit: Some Reminiscences (London: Chapman and Hall, 1921)

Women and Men (Paris: Three Mountains Press, 1923)

Joseph Conrad: A Personal Remembrance (London: Duckworth, 1924)

A Mirror to France (London: Duckworth, 1926)

New York Is Not America (London: Duckworth, 1927)

No Enemy (New York: The Macauley Company, 1929, repr. New York: Ecco Press, 1984)

The English Novel from the Earliest Days to the Death of Joseph Conrad (Philadelphia: Lipincott, 1929, London: Constable, 1930)

Return To Yesterday (London: Victor Gollancz, 1931; reprinted New York: Liveright, 1957)

It Was the Nightingale (Philadelphia: Lipincott, 1933, London: Heinemann, 1934)

Great Trade Route (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1937)

Provence: From Minstrels to the Machine (London, George Allen and Unwin: 1938)

Portraits From Life (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1937), pub. in England as Mightier Than the Sword: Memories and Criticisms, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1938)

The March of Literature from Confucius to Modern Times (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1938, 2nd impr. 1947)

Beinfeld, Solon and Stang, Sondra J., eds, A History of Our Own Times (Manchester: Carcanet, 1989)

Works by Ford: Poetry

Note: This is not a complete list of Ford's published poetry, but only those volumes which were consulted for the purposes of this thesis.

Poems for Pictures and for Notes of Music (London: John MacQueen, 1900)

From Inland and Other Poems (London: Alston Rivers, 1907)

High Germany: Eleven Sets of Verse (London: Duckworth, 1911)

Collected Poems (London: Max Goschen, 1914)

Antwerp (London: The Poetry Bookshop, 1918)

On Heaven and Poems Written on Active Service (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1918)

Mr. Bosphorus and the Muses, Or a Short History of Poetry in Britain (London: Duckworth, 1923)

New Poems (New York: William Edwin Ridge, 1927)

Contributions by Ford to books by other writers

Preface to Stories from De Maupassant, trans. E.M. (London: Duckworth, 1903)

Introduction to transatlantic stories: Selected from The Transatlantic Review (London: Duckworth, 1926)

Preface to Rhys, Jean, The Left Bank and Other Stories (New York: Harper, 1927)

Introduction to Conrad, Joseph, The Sisters (New York: Crosby Gaige, 1928)

Foreword to The English Review Book of Short Stories, compiled by Horace Shipp (London: Sampson Low, Marston, 1932)

Introduction to Hemingway, Ernest, A Farewell to Arms (New York: Modern Library, 1932)

[B] SECONDARY SOURCES

Bibliographies

Harvey, David Dow, Ford Madox Ford 1873-1939: A Bibliography of Works and Criticism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962)

Collections and Anthologies

MacShane, Frank, ed., Critical Writings of Ford Madox Ford (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964)

Ludwig, R.M., ed., Letters of Ford Madox Ford (Princeton: University of Princeton Press, 1965)

Stang, Sondra J., ed., The Ford Madox Ford Reader (Manchester: Carcanet, 1986)

Books and Articles on Ford

Bowen, Stella, Drawn From Life (London: Collins, 1941, repr. London: Virago, 1984)

Green, Robert, Ford Madox Ford: Prose and Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981)

Goldring, Douglas, South Lodge (London: Constable, 1943)

Hunt, Violet, The Flurried Years (London: Hurst and Blackett, [1926])

Judd, Alan, Ford Madox Ford (London: Collins, 1990)

Lentz, Vern Blair, Ford Madox Ford as Critic (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1972)

Londrville, Janice and Richard, 'A Portrait of Ford Madox Ford: Unpublished Letters from the Ford Foster Friendship', English Literature in Transition, 33, no.2, 1990, 181-207.

MacShane, Frank, The Life and Work of Ford Madox Ford (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965)

_____, ed., Ford Madox Ford: The Critical Heritage (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972)

Mizener, Arthur, The Saddest Story: A Biography of Ford Madox Ford (New York and Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1971, London: Bodley Head, 1972)

Moser, Thomas C., The Life in the Fiction of Ford Madox Ford (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980)

Ohmann, Carol, Ford Madox Ford: From Apprentice to Craftsman (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1964)

Pascalata, Julian, Ford Madox Ford and the Practioner Critic (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1981)

Poli, Bernard, Ford Madox Ford and The Transatlantic Review (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967)

Radell, Karen Marguerite, Affirmation in a Moral Wasteland: A Comparison of Ford Madox Ford and Graham Greene (New York: Peter Lang, 1987)

Ruedy, Ralph Hermann, Ford Madox Ford and The English Review (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1976)

Saunders, Max, guest ed., Agenda: Ford Madox Ford, 27 No. 4/ 28 No.1, Winter 1989/Spring 1990.

Secor, R. and M., The Return of the Good Soldier: Ford Madox Ford and Violet Hunt's 1917 Diary ELS Monograph Series (Victoria, British Columbia: University of Victoria, 1983)

Seyersted, Brita Lindberg, Pound / Ford: The Story of a Literary Friendship (New York: New Direction Books, 1982)

_____, Ford Madox Ford and his Relationship to Stephen Crane and Henry James (New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1987)

Stang, Sondra J., Ford Madox Ford (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1977)

_____, guest ed., Antaeus: Ford Madox Ford, No. 56, Spring 1986.

_____, ed., The Presence of Ford Madox Ford (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981)

Wiesenfarth, Joseph, guest ed., Contemporary Literature: Ford Madox Ford and the Arts, 30, No.2, Summer 1989.

Wiley, Paul, Novelist of Three Worlds: Ford Madox Ford (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962)

Background Works

Ackroyd, Peter, Ezra Pound and his World (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980)

_____, T.S.Eliot (London: Hamish Hamilton 1984)

Aldington, Richard, Life for Life's Sake (New York: Viking Press, 1940, repr. London, Cassell: 1968)

Anderson, Margaret, My Thirty Years' War, (London: Alfred A Knopf, 1930)

Anesko, Michael, "Friction with the Market": Henry James and the Profession of Authorship (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986)

Angier, Carole, Jean Rhys (London: André Deutsch, 1990)

Antheil, George, Bad Boy of Music (London: Hurst and Blackett, [1947])

Aubry, G. Jean, Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters, I (London: Heinemann, 1977)

Baker, Carlos, ed., Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters, 1917-1961 (London: Granada,

1981)

_____, Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story (New York: Charles Scribner, 1969, London: Penguin, 1972, repr. 1988)

Barker, Felix, Edwardian London (London: Laurence King, 1995)

Batchelor, John, The Edwardian Novelists (London: Duckworth, 1982)

Beach, Sylvia, Shakespeare and Company (London: Faber, 1960)

Bell, Martin, ed., The Context of English Literature (London: Methuen, 1980)

Benstock, Shari, Women of the Left Bank, (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1986, London: Virago, 1987)

Bergonzi, Bernard, The Turn of the Century: Essays on Victorian and Modern English Literature (London: Macmillan, 1973)

Bernard, Philippe and Dubief, Henri, The Decline of the French Republic 1914-1938, trans. Anthony Foster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)

Biles, Jack I., British Novelists Since 1900 (New York: AMS Press, 1987)

Boyce, Curran and Wingate, eds, Newspaper History: From the 17th Century to the Present Day (London: Constable, 1978)

Bradbury, Malcolm and McFarlane, James, eds, Modernism 1890-1930 (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976)

Brebach, Raymond, Joseph Conrad, Ford Madox Ford and the Making of Romance (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1985)

Brée, Germaine, Twentieth Century French Literature, trans. Louise Guiney (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983)

Brian, Denis, The True Gen: An Intimate Portrait of Hemingway by Those Who Knew Him (New York: Grove Press, 1988)

Brooks, Harold F., T.S.Eliot as Literary Critic (London: Cecil Woolf, 1987)

Bryher, The Heart to Artemis: A Writer's Memoirs (London: Collins, 1963)

Calder-Marshall, Arthur, The Changing Scene (London: Chapman and Hall, 1937)

Carpenter, Humphrey, A Serious Character: The Life of Ezra Pound (London: Faber, 1988)

_____, Geniuses Together, (London: Unwin, 1989)

Chambers, Jessie, D.H.Lawrence: A Personal Record (London: Frank Cass, 1935, 2nd edn 1965)

- Childers, Erskine, The Riddle of the Sands (London: Smith and Elder, 1903, repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1952)
- Cleaton, Irene and Allen, Books and Battles: American Literature 1920-1930 (New York: Cooper Square, 1970)
- Colls, Robert and Dodd, Philip, eds, Englishness: Politics and Culture 1800-1920 (London: Croom Helm, 1976)
- Cowley, Malcolm, Exile's Return: A Literary Odyssey of the 1920s (New York: Viking Press, 1934, rev. London: Bodley Head, 1961)
- Cox, C.B. and Dyson, A.E., eds, The Twentieth Century Mind: History, Ideas and Literature in Britain, I, 1900-1918 (London: Oxford University Press, 1972)
- Cruikshank, J., French Literature and its Background, VI, The Twentieth Century (London: Oxford University Press, 1970)
- Dangerfield, George, The Strange Death of Liberal England (London: Constable, 1936)
- _____, Victoria's Heir (London: Constable: 1942)
- Dennison, Sally, Alternative Literary Publishing: Five Modern Histories (Iowa City, University of Iowa Press: 1984)
- Drabble, Margaret, Arnold Bennett (London: Weidenfeld, 1974)
- Edel, Leon, Bloomsbury: A House of Lions (London: Hogarth Press, 1979)
- Eliot, T.S., ed., Literary Essays of Ezra Pound (London: Faber, 1954)
- Eliot, Valerie, ed., The Letters of T.S.Eliot, I, 1898-1922 (London: Faber, 1988)
- Ellman, Richard, James Joyce (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959, rev. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982, reissued with corrections Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1983)
- _____, ed., Letters of James Joyce, III (London: Faber, 1966)
- _____, Golden Codgers: Biographical Speculations (London: Oxford University Press, 1973)
- _____, Oscar Wilde (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1987, repr. Harmondsworth:, Penguin, 1988)
- Fanning, Michael, ed., France and Sherwood Anderson: Paris Notebook, 1921 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976)
- Finneran, Richard J., Harper, George Mills, Murphy, William M., eds, Letters to W.B.Yeats, II (London: Macmillan, 1977)

Fitch, Noel Riley, Sylvia Beach and the Lost Generation (New York: W.W.Norton, 1983, repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985)

Fitzgerald, Penelope, Charlotte Mew and her Friends (London: Collins, 1984, repr. London: Harvill, 1992)

Flower, J.E., Writers and Politics in Modern France 1909- 1960 (London: Hodder, 1977)

Ford, Boris, ed., The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, VIII, The Edwardian Age and the Inter-War Years (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Ford, Hugh, ed., The Left Bank Revisited: Selections from the Paris Tribune 1917-1934 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972)

____ Published in Paris: American and British Writers, Printers and Publishers in Paris 1920-1939 (London: Garnstone Press, 1975)

____ Four Lives in Paris (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1987)

Forde, Victoria, The Poetry of Basil Bunting (Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe, 1991)

Garnett, Edward, ed., Letters from Conrad 1895 to 1924 (London: Nonesuch Press, 1928)

Garnett, Richard, Constance Garnett: A Heroic Life (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1991)

Gilbert, Stuart, ed., Letters of James Joyce, I (London: Faber, 1957)

Goldring, Douglas, Reputations (London: Chapman and Hall, 1920)

____ The Nineteen Twenties (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1945)

Graham, Walter, English Literary Periodicals (London: Nelson, 1930)

Green, Martin, Children of the Sun, (London: Constable, 1977)

Grover, Philip, ed., Ezra Pound: The London Years 1908-1920 (New York: AMS Press, 1978)

Hamilton, Ian, The Little Magazines: A Study of Six Editors (London: Weidenfeld, 1976)

Hardwick, Joan, An Immodest Violet: The Life of Violet Hunt (London: André Deutsch, 1990)

Heilbrun, Carolyn G., The Garnett Family (London: Allen and Unwin, 1961)

Hemingway, Ernest, A Moveable Feast (New York: Charles Scribner, 1964)

Hepburn, James, The Author's Empty Purse and the Rise of the Literary Agent (London:

Oxford University Press, 1968)

_____. ed., Letters of Arnold Bennett, I, Letters to J.B. Pinker (London: Oxford University Press, 1966)

_____. ed., Letters of Arnold Bennett, II, 1889-1915 (London: Oxford University Press, 1968)

Hills, S.J., The Yellow Book 1894-1897: Notes for an Exhibition at Cambridge University Library April-June 1994, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1994)

Hoffman, F.J., Allen, C., Ulrich, C.F., The Little Magazine: A History and a Bibliography (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946)

Hooker, Denise, Nina Hamnett: Queen of Bohemia (London: Constable, 1986)

Huddleston, Sisley, Bohemian Literary and Social Life in Paris: Salons, Cafes, Studios (London: Harrap, 1928)

_____. Back to Montparnasse (London: Harrap, 1931)

Hunter, Jefferson, Edwardian Fiction (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982)

Hynes Samuel, The Edwardian Turn of Mind (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968, repr. London: Pimlico, 1991)

_____. Edwardian Occasions (London: Routledge, 1972)

_____. A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture (London: Bodley Head, 1990)

Imbert, Maurice and Sorin, Raphaël, Adrienne Monnier et La Maison des Amis des Livres (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1991)

Jefferson, George, Edward Garnett: A Life in Literature (London: Jonathan Cape, 1982)

Jepson, Edgar, Memories of an Edwardian and a Neo-Georgian (London: Richards, 1937)

Karl, Frederick R., Joseph Conrad: Three Lives (London: Faber, 1979)

Karl, Frederick R and Davies, Laurence, The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad, IV, 1908-1911 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Keating, Peter, ed., Into Unknown England 1866-1913: Selections from the Social Explorers (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976)

_____. The Haunted Study: A Social History of the English Novel 1875-1914 (London: Secker and Warburg, 1989)

- Kenner, Hugh, A Sinking Island (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1988)
- Leavis, Q., Fiction and the Reading Public (London: Chatto and Windus, 1932, repr. Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1979)
- Lee, Alan J., The Origins of the Popular Press in England 1855-1914 (London: Croom Helm, 1976)
- Lester, John A. Jr., Journey Through Despair 1880-1914: Transformations in British Literary Culture (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968)
- Lewis, Wyndham, Rude Assignment (London: Hutchinson, 1928)
- McAlmon, Robert, Being Geniuses Together, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1938, rev. London: Michael Joseph, 1970)
- Mairet, Philip, A.R. Orage: A Memoir (New York: University Books, 1936, rev. 1966)
- Martin, Graham, ed., Eliot in Perspective (London: Macmillan, 1970)
- Martin, Wallace, The New Age under Orage: Chapters in English Cultural History (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967)
- Masterman, C.F.G., The Heart of the Empire: Discussion of Problems of Modern City Life in England (London: Fisher Unwin, 1901, repr. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1983)
- _____, The Condition of England, 3rd impr. (London: Methuen, 1909)
- Materer, Timothy, ed., Pound / Lewis: The Letters of Ezra Pound and Wyndham Lewis (London: Faber, 1985)
- _____, ed., The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound to John Quinn 1915-1924, (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1991)
- Meyers, Jeffrey, The Enemy: A Biography of Wyndham Lewis (London: Routledge, 1980)
- _____, Hemingway: A Biography (London: Macmillan, 1985)
- _____, D.H. Lawrence: A Biography (London: Macmillan, 1990)
- Mix, Katherine Lyon, A Study in Yellow: The Yellow Book and Its Contributors, (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1960)
- Monnier, Adrienne, The Very Rich Hours of Adrienne Monnier, trans. Richard McDougall (London: Millington Books, 1976)
- Monro, Harold, ed., Georgian Poetry 1911-1912 (London: The Poetry Bookshop, 1912)
- Morgan, Ted, Somerset Maugham (London: Jonathan Cape, 1980)

- Morris, Lloyd, A Threshold in the Sun (London: Allen and Unwin, 1948)
- Nowell-Smith, S., ed., Edwardian England 1901-1914 (London: Oxford University Press, 1964)
- O'Brien, Justin, ed., N.R.F.: The Most Significant Writings from the *Nouvelle Revue Française* 1919-1940 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1958)
- _____, The French Literary Horizon (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1967)
- Paige, D.D., ed., Letters of Ezra Pound 1907-1941 (London: Faber, 1951)
- Parfitt, George, Fiction of the First World War (London: Faber, 1988)
- Patmore, Derek, ed., My Friends when Young: The Memoirs of Brigit Patmore, (London: Heinemann, 1968)
- Pondrom, Cyrena Norman, English Literary Periodicals 1885-1918 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Columbia, 1965)
- Press, John, A Map of English Verse (London: Oxford University Press, 1969)
- Putnam, Samuel, Paris was our Mistress (New York: Viking Press, 1947)
- Rascoe, Burton, A Bookman's Daybook (New York: Horace Liveright, 1929)
- Read, Donald. ed., Edwardian England (London: Croom Helm, 1982)
- Read, Forrest, ed., The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce (London: Faber, 1968)
- Read, Herbert, Annals of Innocence and Experience (London: Faber, 1940, rev. 1946)
- Reid, B.L., The Man from New York: John Quinn and his Friends (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968)
- Reynolds, Michael, Hemingway: The Paris Years (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989)
- Rhys, Ernest, Everyman Remembers (London: Dent, 1931)
- Rhys, Jean, The Left Bank and Other Stories (London: Harper, 1927)
- Riley, Sam G., ed., Magazines of the American South (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1986)
- Rose, Jonathan, The Edwardian Temperament 1895-1919 (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1986)
- Rose, W.K., ed., Letters of Wyndham Lewis (London: Collins, 1990)
- Ruthven, Ezra Pound as Literary Critic (London: Routledge, 1990)

Scott, Thomas L. and Friedman, Melvin J., eds, with the assistance of Bryer, Jackson R., Pound / The Little Review: The Letters of Ezra Pound to Margaret Anderson: The Little Review Correspondence (London: Faber, 1989)

Selver, Paul, Orage and The New Age Circle (London: Allen and Unwin, 1959)

Seymour, Miranda, A Ring of Conspirators (London: Hodder: 1988)

Shipp, Horace, The English Review Book of Short Stories (London: Sampson Low, 1932)

Simon, Linda, The Biography of Alice B. Toklas (London: Peter Owen, 1978)

Sims, Norman, ed., Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990)

Soskice, Juliet, Chapters from Childhood (London: Selwyn and Blount, 1921, repr. London: George Prior, 1973)

Souhami, Diana, Gertrude and Alice (London: Pandora Press, 1991)

Stearns, Harold, America and the Young Intellectual (New York: Doran, 1921, repr. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1973)

____ ed., Civilization in the United States: An Enquiry by Thirty Americans (London: Jonathan Cape, 1922)

____ ed., America Now: An Enquiry into the Civilization in the United States (New York: Charles Scribner, 1939)

Stein, Gertrude, The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas (London: John Lane, 1933)

Sullivan, Alvin, ed., British Literary Magazines, (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press)

Vol.I The Augustan Age and the Age of Johnson: 1698-1788, pub. 1983

Vol.II The Romantic Age: 1789-1836, pub. 1983

Vol.III The Victorian and Edwardian Age: 1837-1913, pub. 1984

Vol.IV The Modern Age: 1914-1984, pub. 1986

Swinnerton, Frank, The Georgian Literary Scene (London: Heinemann, 1935)

Terrell, Carroll F., Basil Bunting: Man and Poet (Orono: University of Maine Press, 1981)

Thompson, Paul, The Edwardians (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1975, repr. London: Paladin, 1977)

Tint, Herbert, France Since 1918, 2nd edn (London, Batsford: 1980)

Trewin, J.C., The Edwardian Theatre (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976)

Trotter, David, The English Novel in History 1895-1920 (London: Routledge, 1993)

- Tytell, John, Ezra Pound: The Solitary Volcano (London: Bloomsbury, 1987)
- Watts, Cedric, Joseph Conrad: A Literary Life (London: Macmillan, 1989)
- Wells, H.G., Tono-Bungay (London: Macmillan, 1909, repr. Collins, 1962)
- West, Anthony, H.G. Wells: Aspects of a Life (London: Hutchinson, 1984, repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985)
- Williams, Ellen, Harriet Monroe and the Poetry Renaissance: The First Ten Years of Poetry, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977)
- Wiser, William, The Crazy Years: Paris in the Twenties (London: Thames and Hudson, 1983)
- Wright, Harold, Letters of Stephen Reynolds, (London: Hogarth Press, 1923)
- Yeats, W.B., ed., The Oxford Book of Modern Verse 1892-1935 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936)

Unpublished Material

House of Lords Record Office, Snow Hill Papers

Reviews and Periodicals

These are the reviews and periodicals used for the purposes of comparison with The English Review and The Transatlantic Review. The frequency of publication follows the title, and this is followed in turn by the dates of the issues consulted.

- The Academy, weekly, July 4, 1908 to Apr. 3, 1909
- The Acorn, No.1, 1905, No.2, 1906
- Action, monthly, Feb. 1920 to Nov. 1921
- The Adelphi, monthly, June 1923 to Apr. 1925
- The Albany Review, monthly, Apr. to Sep. 1908
- The Anglo French Review, monthly, Feb. 1919 to Dec. 1920
- The Argosy, monthly, Jan. 1900 to Sep. 1901
- Art and Letters, quarterly, July 1917 to Spring 1920
- The Athenaeum, weekly July 4, 1908 to May 25, 1909
- Beltani, No. 1-3, May 1899 to April 1900
- The Bermondsey Book, quarterly, Dec. 1923 to Dec. 1926
- Black and White, weekly, July 4, 1908 to Jan 2, 1909
- Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, monthly, July 1908 to May 1909 and Jan. to June 1924
- Blast, No.1, June 20, 1914, No. 2, July 1915
- The Blue Review, monthly, May to July 1913
- The Bookman, monthly, October 1908 to Sep. 1909 and June 1923 to Apr. 1924
- Broom, monthly, Nov. 1921 to Oct 1922
- The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs, monthly, Mar. 1908 to Mar. 1910

The Bystander, weekly, July 1, 1908 to Apr. 7, 1909
Les Cahiers Idéalistes Français, irregular, Feb. 1917 to Jan. 1920
Calendar of Modern Letters, monthly, Mar. to Aug. 1925
Cassell's Magazine, monthly, Dec. 1907 to July 1908
Chambers Journal, weekly, July 27, 1908
The Chapbook, monthly, July 1919 to June 1923, then yearly 1924 and 1925
Commerce, quarterly, Summer to Winter 1924
Contact, irregular, Dec. 1920 to June 1923
The Contemporary Review, monthly, July 1908 to June 1909
The Cornhill Magazine, monthly, July 1908 to June 1909
Cosmopolis, monthly, Jan. 1896 to Nov. 1898
Coterie, irregular, May 1919 to Winter 1920-1921, then irregular, Nov. 1925 to Summer/Autumn 1927
The Criterion, quarterly, Oct. 1922 to July 1925
Dada, irregular, 1915 to 1922
Dana, monthly, May 1904 to April 1905
The Decachord, bi-monthly, Mar-Apr. 1924
The Dial, monthly, Jan. to Dec. 1924
Le Disque Vert, monthly, May to Dec. 1922, irregular, Dec. 1923 to 1925
The Dome, quarterly, Mar. 1897 to May 1898, monthly until 1900
Drama, monthly, Jan. to Dec. 1924
The Dublin Magazine, monthly, Aug. 1923 to Aug. 1925
The Edinburgh Review, quarterly, June 1908 to Apr. 1909 and June 1923 to Apr. 1924
The Egoist, fortnightly, Jan 1, 1914 to Sep. 15, 1914, monthly, May 1, 1915 to Oct. 1918, then irregular Nov./Dec. 1918 to Dec. 1919
The English Review, monthly, Dec. 1908 to Dec. 1910, then Jan. to Dec. 1924
The Exile, irregular, Spring 1927 to Autumn 1928
The Fortnightly Review, monthly, July 1908 to June 1909 and Jan. to Sep. 1924
Genius, bi-annually, 1919 to 1921
The Golden Hind, quarterly, Oct. 1922 to July 1924
Good Words, monthly, Nov. 1904 to May 1906
Green Sheaf, monthly, 1903 to 1904
Harper's Monthly Magazine, monthly, July 1908 to Oct. 1910
The International, monthly, Dec. 1907 to Dec. 1909
Life and Letters, monthly, Nov. 1923 to June 1924
Littérature, monthly, Mar 1919 to June 1920, then irregular, July/Aug. 1920 to June 1924
The Little Review, monthly, Mar 1914 to July 1919, then approx. quarterly Oct. 1919 to Spring 1924, then irregular, Autumn 1924/ Winter 1925 to May 1929
The London Magazine, monthly, June 1908 to Feb. 1909
Longman's Magazine, monthly, May to Oct. 1905
MacMillan's Magazine, monthly, Nov. 1906 to Oct. 1907
Les Marges, monthly, Jan. to June 1924
The Mask, quarterly, 1923 and 1924
Mercure de France, fortnightly, 1923 and 1924
The Monthly Review, Apr. to June, 1907
The Nation, weekly, July 11, 1908 to Sep. 4, 1909
The Nation and Athenaeum, weekly, Oct. 6 1923 to May 23, 1924
The National Review, monthly, July 1908 to Apr. 1909
Le Navire d'Argent, monthly, June 1925 to Jan. 1926
Neolith, quarterly, Nov. 1907 to Aug. 1908
The New Age, weekly, Oct 29, 1908 to Apr. 1, 1909 and Nov. 23, 1923 to Dec. 11, 1924

New Freewoman, quarterly, 1913
The New Quarterly, quarterly, Nov. 1907 to May 1910
The New Statesman, weekly, Oct. 1923 to Apr. 1925
The Nineteenth Century and After, monthly, July 1908
The Northern Review, monthly, May to Sep. 1924
La Nouvelle Revue Française, monthly, Jan. to June 1924
Notes and Queries, weekly, July 4, 1908 to May 25, 1909
Outlook, weekly, July 4, 1908 to June 12, 1909
The Owl, irregular, May 1919 to Nov. 1923
The Pall Mall Magazine, monthly, July 1908 to June 1909
Pearson's Magazine, monthly, July 1908 to Mar. 1909
Poetry, monthly, Oct. 1912 to Sep. 1924
The Poetry Review, monthly, Jan. to Dec. 1912
Poetry of Today, quarterly, 1924
The Quarterly Review, quarterly, July 1908 to Apr. 1909 and Jan. to Oct. 1924
Der Querschitt, monthly, 1924
The Quiver, monthly, Oct. 1908 to Apr. 1909
The Review of Reviews, monthly, July 1908 to Apr. 1909
La Revue de l'Amerique Latine, monthly, Jan. to Sep. 1922
La Revue de Paris, monthly, 1924
Rhythm, quarterly, summer 1911 to spring 1912, monthly June 1912 to Mar. 1913
Samhain, occasional, seven issues between Oct. 1901 and Nov. 1908
The Saturday Review, weekly, Jan. 2 to Dec. 19, 1909 and Jan. 5 to June 7, 1924
The Savoy, monthly, July to Dec. 1896.
The Scottish Chapbook, monthly, Aug. 1922 to Nov./Dec. 1923
Scribner's Magazine, monthly, July 1908 to Jan. 1909 and Jan. 1924
Secession, irregular, Spring 1922 to Apr. 1924
The Shanachie, six issues between Jan. and Winter 1907
The Spectator, weekly, July 4, 1908 to Apr. 3 1909.
The Sphere, weekly, Dec. 26, 1908 to Jan. 9, 1909.
The Strand Magazine, monthly, July 1908 to April 1909.
Thrush, monthly, Jan. 1901 to Feb. 1903.
The Thrush, monthly, Dec. 1909 to May 1910.
The Times Literary Supplement, weekly, July 16, 1908 to June 10, 1909.
This Quarter, irregular, 1925 to 1929
Time and Tide, weekly, Jan. 4 to Aug. 8, 1924
Tit Bits, weekly, July 4, 1908.
Transition, monthly, Apr. to Dec. 1927
The Twentieth Century Quarterly, Apr., Aug., Nov., 1906
Tyro, irregular, [1922]
Vanity Fair, weekly, 1909
The Venture, two issues, 1903 and 1905
La Vie des Lettres et des Arts, bi-monthly, 1924
The Westminster Review, monthly, July 1908 to June 1909
Wheels, annually, 1916 to 1921
The Windsor Magazine, monthly, June 1908 to July 1909
The Yellow Book, quarterly, Apr. 1894 to Apr. 1897.